The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1889.

The Week.

A MORE melancholy picture of the humiliating position into which the spoils system forces a President, could not be drawn than is Mr. Harrison's own statement of his present situation. The Washington correspondent of the *World* says, that the President is growing very restless under the criticism made upon the deliberation with which he is filling the important offices, and that to an importunate Congressman who called to urge the claims of a constituent for office he said: "I am daily criticised in the papers, and even by individuals who call upon me in quest of office, for being slow to nominate men for those important missions. The reason is the simplest in the world. I have not had time. I have been overrun with office-seekers since I arrived in Washington, and instead of having the time to devote to the consideration and selection of foreign ministers and other important officials, I have actually spent it all in listening to the statements of delegations, and in the purely clerical labor incident to the proper classification and arrangement of applications for office." Think of the chief executive of a great nation, with all the onerous duties which devolve upon such an official, which of themselves would consume all his time and strength, complaining that he has to spend all his time and use up all his strength in listening to the pleas of spoils-hunters, and in performing the purely clerical labor of classifying and arranging applications for office!

Secretary Windom has had the following notice posted in the Treasury:

"The Secretary of the Treasury reserves the time from 10 till 11:30 A. M. for receiving Senators and members of the House of Representatives. Other persons desiring to see him upon matters relating to official patronage will please call between 11:30 A. M. and 1 P. M. The Secretary requests that he may be excused from receiving visitors after 1 P. M., in order that he may be able to devote a part of the day to the consideration of the current business of the Department."

It appears from this that the Secretary begins his official day at 10 A. M.—a very proper hour—but does not reach the business of the Government, or "the current business of the Department," as he calls it, until 1 P. M., after three hours of that most exhausting of occupations, listening to people who, in nine cases out of ten, are making either impossible requests or impracticable suggestions. We grant that he ought to give some portion of the day to interviews with Senators and Representatives on public business, but we presume there can be no doubt that the business he transacts with them between 10 and 11:30 A. M. is of precisely the same nature as that which he transacts with the persons who come to "see him upon matters relating to official patronage," between 11:30 A. M. and 1 P. M. That is, he spends three hours of his day talking about "spoils" with importunate beggars to whom the taxpayers whom he represents, and with whose interests he is charged, owe nothing whatever. Consequently, he comes to his own sworn work jaded in mind and body, and is compelled, when in arrears with it, to take out of the hours which he owes to health and recreation, enough time to make up for what he has lost with office-seekers in the morning. All this waste of time and strength is the direct result of the practice of treating offices as party booty, and making changes in the service simply to satisfy electioneering claims. In other words, half the official time of the Minister of Finance of the greatest commercial and manufacturing State in the world is given to consultation over plans for corrupting the fiscal administration and diminishing its efficiency.

The appointment of Corporal Tanner as head of the Pension Bureau commits the Administration to support of the wholesale pension schemes which are so zealously pushed by the claim-agents and the politicians who make bids for the "soldier vote." Tanner is one of the most prominent of the Grand Army politicians who have converted that organization into a machine for securing pensions, and, as the Washington correspondent of the *Press* says, "has long been regarded as a pension liberalist of the most pronounced type." The same correspondent says that "Tanner's appointment is generally regarded as the beginning of a new pension era. It may, and likely will, result in universal pensions as the simplest and cheapest way out of it. In fact, a universal-pension bill will early be introduced in the next Congress, and, unless it should be deemed inexpedient and killed by caucus, it will become a law." We regret to say that there is too much reason to fear that this forecast will prove to have been correct.

Republican newspapers as a rule thus far are slow in expressing any opinion regarding the New York Post-office. Occasionally one is found, like the Rochester *Democrat and Chronicle*, edited by the Hon. Charles E. Fitch, Professor of Journalism, which takes the ground that Mr. Pearson ought not to be reappointed, on the ground that he "has had the place long enough"; but most of them take refuge in silence. An honorable exception is found in the case of the Buffalo *Express*, which says that Mr. Pearson "is a Republican who has so nobly vindicated the principles of his party during the last four years that the Democratic Administration could find no pretext for removing him," and makes this comment upon the course of those Republican papers which advise President Harrison not to reappoint him: "They invite him to write himself down lower than Grover Cleveland: Such counsel is an insult to President Harrison's intelligence, to say nothing of his civil-service-reform professions."

The Indianapolis *Journal* publishes a leading editorial article which, without mentioning the new Postmaster in that city, rebukes all spoilsmen who talk about the Civil-Service Law in the way he is quoted as talking. The *Journal* begins with the statement that "the Republican party is pledged in every possible way to the principle of civil-service reform, as embraced in the present law and the rules under it." After setting forth the scope of the law, it explains its application to the Indianapolis Post-office, which is the only one in the State embraced by the statute. It points out that, with the exception of ten positions out of about one hundred, all the places are subject to the law, and that, while the incumbents may be removed at pleasure, their successors can only be appointed in accordance with civil-service rules. "The Postmaster," it adds, "can discharge a clerk or carrier for any cause satisfactory to himself, but he cannot appoint one except in compliance with the Civil-Service Law; *and if a vacancy is to be filled, the law does not permit him to know whether it will be filled by a Republican or a Democrat.*" In order to leave no possible doubt as to its meaning, the *Journal* concludes with the following remark, which Postmaster Wallace may well regard as in the light of a warning: "The idea that the law can be construed out of existence, or juggled with in such a way as to run Republicans in without complying with its provisions, is a great mistake."

Justice Stanley Matthews, who died on Thursday, had been a member of the Supreme Court for about eight years, having been confirmed by a very narrow margin in the spring of 1881, upon President Garfield's nomination, after his name had been rejected when sent in by President Hayes the previous winter. He had served four years in the Senate, and his record in favor of the permanency of the greenbacks, the payment of the public debt in depreciated silver, and the unlimited coinage of silver, rendered his selection for the highest bench a surprise and disappointment to the country. Although a good lawyer, he had never won the highest rank in his profession, and his service as judge has been without special distinction. His death precipitates upon the President a fresh contest for place which must almost make him despair. Ohio will undoubtedly insist upon the succession, as she has not got much so far, and is now left without representation in the Supreme Court for the first time in sixty years. John McLean, who was appointed by Jackson in 1829, served until 1861, and was succeeded by Noah H. Swayne, who was given Salmon P. Chase as a colleague in 1864, and Morrison R. Waite upon Chase's death in 1873. Swayne retired in 1881, and was succeeded by Matthews; while William B. Woods, who was appointed in 1880, and credited to Georgia, al-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ways remained much more an Ohio man than a representative of the South.

There are strong reasons for believing that complete ballot-reform laws will be passed in at least two more States before the close of their present legislative sessions, namely, Missouri and Wisconsin. It is possible that Connecticut also will be added to the list, though the Republican majority in that State appears to be acting in a double-faced way in regard to the subject. While seeing the necessity of paying heed to the strong public demand for such legislation, the Republicans do not yet unite in favor of a bill which embodies the most approved principles of the reform system. In Missouri all authorities agree that the Legislature will pass a bill embodying a complete application of the Australian system. In Wisconsin the Senate has passed a bill extending the provisions of the present admirable Milwaukee law and making them applicable to the entire State. As passed, this bill provides for secret, official ballots printed and distributed at the public expense. It is interesting to note that in all quarters of the country in which the ballot question is discussed, Gov. Hill is recognized as the leading enemy of the reform.

The movement among American artists for the repeal of the duty on works of art is a step which ought to have been taken some time ago. That all except a feeble minority of our artists feel pained and humiliated by this duty, has been known to Congress ever since the present tax of 30 per cent. was imposed, but Congress does not pay attention to unorganized opinion on any subject. If the artists take steps to organize their opinion, they can make it effective. We notice that one of the speakers at the late meeting wanted a definition of works of art, so that the term might not include chromos and colored photographs, but should be limited to paintings in oil and water colors. This would be a fair distinction if the Treasury wanted the money collected on such works. But since it does not, the distinction seems to be either frivolous or of a protective character. In either case it should not be allowed, and we venture the prediction that Congress will never allow the pictures which rich men buy to come in free, while the humbler decorations of the poor man's home are taxed 30 per cent.

Somebody in Washington has been "stuffing" the correspondent of the Springfield *Republican*. He writes on Saturday:

"Treasury officials say there is no reason why the work of Secretary Fairchild in ferreting out the sugar frauds should be affected at present by the change of Administration. If the work had been left half completed, there might have been some reason to fear that it would not be carried forward, but it was left so near done that it is only a question of 'letting well enough alone.' Secretary Fairchild restored the proper method of appraisement, and he dismissed the men who had been guilty of dishonesty, and put new men in their places."

There is not one word of truth in this. Secretary Fairchild "ferreted out" no "sugar frauds." He does not even pretend now that he did. He did not "restore the proper method of appraisement," because he found no wrong method. He did not dismiss men "guilty of dishonesty." He dismissed men against whom he brought charges for which he had no proper evidence whatever, and whom he never brought before any tribunal, and whom he stultified himself by slandering on the eve of his own retirement from office.

Mr. Henry C. Bowen, the senior editor of the *Independent*, accuses us of falsehood in saying that the evidence against Quay and Clarkson in the matter of the theft of the *Voice's* mail-lists was "undisputed," inasmuch as the *Independent* had "published the completest denials authorized by both Clarkson and Quay." We notice Mr. Bowen as often as we do, because he edits the only religious paper which has ventured with openness and minuteness to undertake the defence or vindication of the various prominent Republican corruptionists of the late canvass. But it is impossible to treat him very seriously. He was expelled from his church in Brooklyn on the 18th of May, 1876, for repeated and complicated lying, when he was about fifty years old, a misfortune which usually extinguishes a moralist for ever. We had had before this, to wit, on the 8th of October, 1874, to expose his secret sale of his columns to the old Northern Pacific Railroad, under a contract by which he bound himself, in consideration of $50,000 in bonds and $460,000 in stock (which he actually received), to give the "exclusive interest and influence of his money and editorial columns" to promote the sale of the securities of the road. After Jay Cooke's failure, the trustee in bankruptcy discovered the transaction, demanded restitution, on the ground that the contract was immoral, and legal proceedings were, we believe, begun to compel it, but somehow the editor managed to hold on to his booty. Controversy about truthfulness or journalistic honor with such a man is of course a little ridiculous, but we will continue it far enough to say that the Quay-Clarkson "completest denials" in the *Independent* consist simply of an assertion by Mr. Bowen that "he is authorized to say that these gentlemen make the following statements," which "statements" are simply quibbles or evasions. The matter will, we believe, almost certainly soon come before the courts at the instance of the *Voice*, so that we need to say no more about it now.

In a speech in the Assembly on Friday, the Speaker, Mr. Fremont Cole, made the following remarkable statement concerning the mysterious appearance of $4,000 upon his private bank account about the 1st of November last:

"Then the State Committee, in its kindness, in its generosity, realizing the fact, I presume, that I was in the native county of Gov. Hill, that we have a large vote that is questionable, sent quite a large amount of money into that county. Of course, my friends, perhaps that was not a wise thing. Perhaps it was not a wise thing for me to be the receiver of that money. Yet I have explained the facts. I have withheld nothing. I have told Mr. Seward and the other attorney the places where that money came from. It came from Republicans high up in official life; it came, a large part of it—almost all of it, with the exception of a few hundred dollars—from the State Committee, and yet they say that should be explained."

This is as frank a confession as that of Mr. Ainsworth to the effect that, if it had not been for the ceiling job, Harrison would not have been elected.

Trust certificates are becoming the favorite gamble in Wall Street, and the rapid rise of the Sugar Trust has given a great impetus to the trading. Of course speculators will take hold of anything that they see, or think they see, a profit in, but the investing public should not be deluded by the idea that Trusts are safe places for money in the long run. They have as yet no legal status, and in the present temper of the public mind they are not likely to gain any. They have not the element of continuity, and they cannot acquire it. Dodging from one State to another to pick up charters, they take on a fugitive character, which should make people cautious about putting money into them. It has been held in this State that a corporation is dissolved by going into a Trust. Therefore all corporations are dissolvable which go into Trusts. The next step of the Trust will probably be to get the dissolved corporation reincorporated in another State until that State dissolves it. But eventually all the States will spew them out, and we think the process will be rapid as the monopoly character of Trusts discloses itself.

The Dundee (Scotland) *Advertiser*, commenting on the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Oregonian Railway case, says:

"Whatever are the grounds on which the Supreme Court has set aside the decision of Judge Deady, this decision will give a serious blow to American credit in this country. The faith of British investors in the safety of contracts under the Constitution of the United States, which has hitherto been free from doubt or fear, will receive a rude shock, and the remarkable passage in Mr. Bryce's new book, which practically suggests that even the highest of the American judges cannot be trusted where questions as between States are concerned, will receive a meaning which could not till now have been read in it."

The immediate occasion for this comment on judicial honor and American credit is the fact stated by the *Advertiser* that the Oregonian Railway securities—stocks, bonds, and claims of various kinds amounting to £540,000—are held in Dundee and the vicinity thereof. The decision in the case, as we recall it, was to the effect that a corporation cannot exercise powers not conferred upon it either expressly or by necessary implication, and that neither the Oregonian Railway nor the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company had the power conferred upon it to execute a lease or to receive one. This is no new principle in the line of Supreme Court decisions or in the law of corporations. In point of fact, if the court had decided the case differently, it would have been obliged to reverse itself. How far American credit would have been helped by the Supreme Court deciding questions one way to-day and another way to-morrow, we shall not undertake to determine. But if the Supreme Court of the United States has made any reputation for itself in the way of holding the scales evenly, it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has done so by holding them evenly between Americans and foreigners. The amount in controversy in this case, present and contingent, was about $800,000. To suppose that the Court took this sum of money, or any sum, into consideration in rendering the decision is too preposterous. We do not recall the passage in Mr. Bryce's book to which reference is made, but we venture to say that it does not warrant the application which the Dundee *Advertiser* gives it.

Sir Thomas Farrer's letters to the London *Times* on the Sugar-Bounties Convention have been published by the Cobden Club as a treatise for general circulation. A more destructive commentary on an economical project has seldom been put in print. It is hardly possible to conceive, after reading these letters, how the anti-bounty treaty can ever go into effect. The force relied on to make it effective is the boycotting clause, which excludes the sugar of bounty-paying countries from all the countries that are parties to the Convention. France is not a party to the Convention. Austria has made reservations which leave her at liberty to join or not according as circumstances shall appear in September, 1891, the time fixed for the Convention to go into operation. Sir Thomas shows that the effect will be merely to turn the bounty-fed sugar from England to the United States, where it will displace an equal amount of free sugar grown in the English and other West Indies. No gain will accrue to the English colonies, in whose behalf the Convention was in large part drummed up. On the other hand, England will cut herself off from the cheapest sugar that is to be had. The idea of making it a grievance that foreigners want to give you something for nothing, to make you a present of one of the most valuable and desirable products of modern art and industry, is turned into immeasurable ridicule. The operative parts of the treaty are shown to be full of difficulty, as, for example, the mode of determining whether any particular sugar is bounty-fed or not. It is a curious feature of the treaty that Great Britain alone is forbidden to levy differential duties on sugar in order to favor her own colonies. Spain and Holland, which are both parties to the Convention, and which have the largest sugar-producing colonies in the world, may do this, but England cannot.

The copper conspiracy was made the subject of debate in the French Chamber of Deputies on Thursday, and the Ministry barely escaped defeat on a motion for a public prosecution of the conspirators. But for the fact that the Ministry is only a few days old, and that the French people are beginning to feel the force of foreign criticism on the ephemeral character of their governments, it is most likely that the motion for a prosecution would have prevailed. In the end the Minister of Justice promised unequivocally that he would cause an investigation to be made, and would institute a prosecution if he should find that the law had been violated. Probably he has no serious intention of prosecuting anybody, since his colleague, the Minister of Finance, who has put himself in the attitude of a harlequin by helping the Comptoir d'Escompte to prolong its existence by about ten days, would be still further shown up as having used the powers of the State to prolong the life of the conspiracy. In the course of the debate the Paris house of Rothschild was mentioned as one of the leaders in the alleged conspiracy. M. Rouvier repelled the insinuation, saying that its refutation could be left to the good sense of the public. It is to be hoped that it will not be left to that fleeting tribunal, whose judgments are apt to be shifty and indeterminate. It is of much importance to know whether houses like the Rothschilds and the Barings, upon which the soberer classes of the community are accustomed to repose with absolute trust, are speculators, or whether they adhere through all the ages to sound principles of finance.

The *Christian Union* is engaged in a curious controversy with some Bostonians over the "Boston Monday Lectureship," a name given to himself some years ago by the Rev. Joseph Cook. It appears that the Boston correspondent of the *Christian Union* has reported that public interest in the "Monday Lectureship" is waning, and cited as proof of this the meagreness of the reports of his addresses in the daily papers. Some friends of the "Lectureship" thereupon alleged that this was unfair and misleading, and that the public interest in him was as great as ever. The *Christian Union*, however, stands its ground in the matter of fact, and now adds some reasons why public interest in the Lectureship should decline. It says:

> "He was for a few years a leader. His orthodoxy was both liberal and positive. He put rationalism on its defence; and, as an interpreter of the progressive thoughts of a foreign school of teachers, did real service to the American Church. But he lacks moral perspective. He failed to comprehend the moral and theological issues of the latter quarter of the nineteenth century. He allowed himself to become the partisan of a sect within a sect."

The truth is—the true truth, as the French say—that Mr. Cook was for some years an excellent Monday entertainment for ministers tired with their Sunday work, and for religious people of little reading or cultivation of any kind, who were puzzled by the heavy assaults on religion which followed the appearance of Darwin's book, and some smaller publications of Tyndall's and Huxley's. These simple souls were pleased with the rhetorical blows which Mr. Cook administered to the enemies of the faith, and above all with the air of "science" which he managed to give his discourses by charges of inaccuracy and blundering against real scientists. He may have "done real service to the American church"; but that he ever "put rationalism on its defence," would be hard to show. If this means anything, it must mean that some acknowledged representative or representatives of rationalism felt bound to answer him. Who were they? It ought to be easy to name them. We have not the least doubt that "the Boston Monday Lectureship," and his career from first to last, have done religion lasting harm, by giving prominence to a champion of such slender intellectual equipment and such extraordinary recklessness and inaccuracy. We might even go so far as to say that they are one of the least creditable episodes in the intellectual history of New England.

There has been no such contribution of "scientific thought" to theological controversy in a long time as that which the Rev. Dr. Talmage made in his sermon on Sunday. He was speaking of Jonah, and rebutting the charge so often made by scientists and other sceptics that Jonah could not have lived for three days in the whale's belly. Here is the answer, and we advise the Rev. Joseph Cook to look to his laurels, for it is far ahead of any of his "science" that we have ever seen:

> "And as to Jonah remaining alive in the monster's belly for three days—why, the fact is, the gastric juice had no chance—Jonah kept bobbin' around so. And what more natural than that the monster should after this regurgitate Jonah on shore? The sea monster was as tired of Jonah as he was of the fish. There's not the least bit of improbability or impracticability about it."

The theory which Dr. Talmage propounded some years ago, and which formed the subject of some acrimonious controversy with Dr. "Bob" Ingersoll, was that Jonah avoided the action of the gastric juice by taking refuge in the whale's mouth. To this Dr. Ingersoll replied that an inspection of Dr. Talmage's photograph explained how he came to entertain so grotesque a hypothesis.

The appearance of Mr. Chamberlain on the scene with a fresh plan for the settlement of the Irish question is one of the things which now lend a touch of humor to the almost tragic condition of English politics. He is said, we believe, to have now produced something like fifteen proposals for making Ireland happy, as substitutes for Gladstone's Home-Rule Bill, and they are invariably received with much laughter, owing to the fact that he has lost all the influence he ever had with his own party outside the town of Birmingham, where he is gratefully remembered as an efficient municipal reformer and administrator. For some time after he broke with the Liberals, he used to be got to write a letter in behalf of the Liberal-Unionist candidate at "bye-elections," but this was so frequently followed by Gladstonian victories that it began to be very amusing also, and he has dropped it. The trouble with all his plans, as well as with those of the Tories and Liberal Unionists generally, for the pacification of Ireland, is, that they do not take the feelings of the Irish into account. No plan can succeed which the Irish will not accept, and they will not accept any plan about which they are not consulted, and which emanates from men who habitually revile them and their leaders, as Chamberlain does. They hate him as he hates Gladstone, and will not adopt his plans for the same reason as he will not adopt Gladstone's. Human nature is distributed among politicians of all nationalities in tolerably equal proportions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BEHRING SEA QUESTION.

THE President's proclamation forbidding the catching of seals in Behring Sea except by persons authorized by the United States Government, *i. e.*, the Alaska Commercial Company, is issued in pursuance of an act of Congress passed in the last days of the Cleveland Administration. This act is imperative in terms, leaving no discretion with the President. It applies to all persons, of whatever nationality. Although we cannot give law to the subjects of other nations in waters more than a marine league from our shores, we can and must bring the seal fishery within some sort of regulation, unless we are to allow the seals to be destroyed, as we have unfortunately allowed the buffalo to be destroyed on our own territory. The method we have adopted is awkward. It would have been more conformable to reason and courtesy to have concerted a plan with the other nations interested, viz., Great Britain, Russia, and Japan, before warning them off, especially since the official correspondence just published shows that all three were quite willing to join us in measures for protecting the seals.

We judge that these facts were not known to Congress when the act of March 2 was passed. We now stand before the world as having acknowledged the right of other countries to a voice in the settlement of the question, having invited them to join us in adopting a particular policy, having received their acquiescence, and then, without any kind of warning, ordered them out. This is one of the frequent *gaucheries* of the conference committees of Congress. It seems as though Mr. Bayard had been neglectful of his duties in the premises, but we cannot pronounce judgment until we know what were his reasons for not replying in 1887 to the request of the three Governments for a draft of regulations to protect the seal fisheries in Behring Sea. Under the circumstances, we cannot wonder that the Canadians are taken by surprise at the issuing of the proclamation. We may indulge the hope, however, that the proceedings taken under the proclamation may not make the situation more awkward than the act of March 2 has already made it.

It will be recalled that in 1886 and 1887 a number of schooners sailing from British Columbia were seized by our cruisers in Behring Sea for catching seals in violation of our laws. They were released because it was found upon investigation that our laws did not prohibit foreigners from catching seals there, but only our own citizens, and because the right to police Behring Sea outside the three-mile limit, although at one time asserted by Russia while Alaska was under her jurisdiction, had been virtually denied by us at that time, and was at all events a matter of dispute. The necessity of coming to an understanding with other nations claiming and exercising rights of navigation and fishing there was patent. Secretary Bayard accordingly addressed an identical note to all the Powers interested and to several not interested. Among the latter were France, Germany, and Sweden. The note invited the Governments "to enter into such an arrangement with the Government of the United States as will prevent the citizens of either country from killing seal in Behring Sea, at such times and places and by such methods as at present are pursued, and which threaten the speedy extermination of those animals and consequent serious loss to mankind." The assent of all the Governments addressed was received except those of Germany and Sweden. The former did not reply at all. The latter replied that she had no interests in Behring Sea, but would be glad to join hereafter in case her subjects should engage in the seal fishery in that quarter of the globe. The Government of France replied that she had no interests in that quarter, but would none the less be disposed to consider any plan for a conference on the subject. The reply of England was given in a despatch from Minister Phelps, dated November 12, 1887, in the following words:

"His Lordship [Lord Salisbury] promptly acquiesced in this proposal on the part of Great Britain, and suggested that I should obtain from my Government and submit to him a sketch of a system of regulations which would be adequate for the purpose. I have therefore to request that I may be furnished as early as possible with a draft of such a code as in your judgment should be adopted. I would suggest also that copies of it be furnished at the same time to the Ministers of the United States in Germany, Sweden, and Norway, Russia, France, and Japan, in order that it may be under consideration by the Governments of those countries. A mutual agreement between all the Governments interested may thus be reached at an early day."

Here the matter was, for some unexplained reason, allowed to drop.

Our position on the Aleutian Islands is a very fortunate one. We own the trap to which the fur-seals resort in great numbers every year. Other seal-catchers can only find them in the open waters and in limited numbers, but the result of such fishing is to kill off the females and gradually to exterminate the race. Under the regulated fishing of the islands, nobody is allowed to kill the females, and thus the continuity of the fur-seal family is assured. The British Columbian seal-fisher, like the American buffalo-hunter, has no care for the continuity of the family. He is concerned only to take as many skins as possible. Obviously, something must be done to protect an industry so important to civilized mankind and to the natives of the islands, whose very existence depends upon the preservation of the fishery. The negotiation which was suspended in 1887 ought to be, and we presume will be, renewed. Although the act of March 2 has put us in an unfortunate and somewhat grotesque attitude, we cannot refuse our medicine. We have acknowledged other people's rights in Behring Sea, and we must listen to what they say.

THE PENSION SHARKS.

IN his veto of the Dependent Pension Bill, President Cleveland used the following language: "Recent personal observation and experience constrain me to refer to another result which will inevitably follow the passage of this bill. It is sad, but nevertheless true, that already in the matter of procuring pensions there exists a widespread disregard of truth and good faith, stimulated by those who as agents undertake to establish claims for pensions, heedlessly entered upon by the expectant beneficiary, encouraged, or at least not condemned, by those unwilling to obstruct a neighbor's plans."

Some Republican organs two years ago were inclined to think that the Democratic President was guilty of uttering slanders when he said this. A new witness now takes the stand, who cannot be accused either of Democratic partisanship or of a lack of sympathy with Union soldiers. Gen. H. V. Boynton, the veteran Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*, has just sent that journal a letter on the pension question which should command general attention. "The fact is," says Gen. Boynton, "the pension system calls for sharp revision. The pension roll is the most sacred list of the Government. It should not, therefore, be tainted even in the name of patriotism. *There have been estimates made by the best Republican friends which the soldiers ever had, which indicate that at least a quarter of the pension roll is what may be called, without harshness, unworthy.*"

Gen. Boynton points out how this state of things has come about. The chief agency has been the claim-agents, who, with their advertising dodgers and their circulars, have kept the veteran element in constant ferment on the subject of pensions. He admits that there are honorable exceptions, but says that they are few. These agents have held out false expectations, and led thousands upon thousands to apply for pensions who, except for these confidence men, would never have entertained the idea. They also work in countless and insidious ways upon every organization of veterans, and are industrious and untiring in securing petitions for every form of wholesale pension legislation, with which they spur Congressmen to one scheme after another. "As a class," he says, "they have been a demoralizing element in the country, and large numbers of them deserve no other designation than that of sharks."

The situation has become so serious that Gen. Boynton thinks it necessary to sound an alarm to prevent the national bankruptcy which would be threatened by the passage of the service-pension scheme now so zealously pushed. He shows that the appropriations for pensions for the next fiscal year reach the enormous sum of $81,750,000, and that a service pension would require in round numbers fully $100,000,000 a year more—which is, we are persuaded, an underestimate. Moreover, the question of arrears also enters here, since the proposition to remove all limits is pushed with quite as much pertinacity, and with quite as much influence, as is the scheme for a service pension. It is altogether within bounds, Gen. Boynton thinks, to say that the two propositions would carry the pension appropriation to $200,000,000; and here again most students of the subject will hold that he has underestimated the actual outgo required. As the excess of receipts over expenditures has been estimated at only $49,000,000, a great deficiency of course would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be created immediately, and taxes would have to be increased.

This vast outlay would be largely for the benefit of men who have no valid claim whatever upon the Government. Already there are far too many men drawing pensions who are not entitled to them. "There is not a community in the North," says Gen. Boynton, "where there are not men drawing pensions who, all their neighbors know well, are no longer disabled, even if they ever were. Of late years there has been more old-soldiering in connection with obtaining pensions than there ever was in the field. The fact that men were once shot, or once disabled by any of the various casualties of the field, is no equitable reason why they should remain on the pension rolls, if they are now well, unless their first disability brought them into financial need from which they haven't recovered."

What is really needed, in the opinion of this excellent authority, is not the putting of everybody who was ever in the army upon the pension roll, but a rigid scrutiny and close pruning of the present roll, to get off the names of the many who have no right to draw pensions; and then liberal provision for those who are really disabled and destitute, so that no veteran shall be obliged to remain in a poor-house or to depend upon private or organized charity. "But in order to enable the Government to perform his work on the liberal scale which should attend it," Gen. Boynton concludes his letter, "the comrades who are in health and comfortably fixed in life, or so fixed that their own efforts bring them a fair support, should scorn to ask for pensions merely on the ground of having been in the service. They should unite to devise and urge legislation to protect and support these needy ones, as they once cared for their wounded on the field. To those who carried the flag to victory and have present health and are surrounded with moderate comforts, these should be rich compensations far above any that a pension roll can give."

All this is eminently sound doctrine, and the best thing about it is that it comes from a source which entitles it to great weight. It had begun to look as though the pension sharks were to meet with no opposition in their raid upon the Treasury, but Gen. Boynton's manly and earnest protest should serve as a rallying-cry for all those who do not want to see the honor of the Union soldier entirely obscured—all the more since the appointment of Corporal Tanner to be Commissioner of Pensions.

THE NORTHWEST RAILWAY SITUATION.

UNDER reductions begun by the Chicago, Burlington and Northern Railroad, the old four and grain rate of 7½ cents per 100 pounds between Minneapolis and Chicago, which was raised to 12½ cents by great efforts last fall, seems likely to be reëstablished. It is unfortunate for the effect upon the investor's mind that this reduction should have followed so soon upon the completion of the inter-State agreement, and it is therefore pertinent to inquire how far the Chicago, Burlington and Northern was justified in its action. In spite of the doubt as to the class to which the Soo Line should be assigned in any grouping of competitors; in spite of the fact that it is in part a rival of the Lake Shore, Michigan Central, and other roads of the Central Traffic Association, it also in part belongs geographically to the group of roads running south from St. Paul and Minneapolis. It was probably a mistaken policy which did not arrange to include this road and the St. Paul and Duluth under the presidents' agreement in some form, for the Minneapolis and Sault Ste. Marie was built by Minneapolis millers for the express purpose of providing an independent outlet for flour, and thus preventing a combination of the Minneapolis-Chicago roads to raise the rate on that traffic—in short, to frustrate the very plan and object for which the presidents' agreement was made. In railroading, as in all other branches of trade, the one competitor settles the pace for all the rest.

But there is one factor more powerful than the Soo Line which must soon determine the question of Minneapolis rates, and that is the open lake. It is a fact, all-important in any study of the railroad situation in the Northwest, that Duluth during navigation is as near New York as is Chicago, and that flour or grain can be and is carried at the same tariff from Duluth to Buffalo as from Chicago to Buffalo. If we remember that Minneapolis is 150 miles from Duluth, we are prepared to understand why the flour rate for those 150 miles is the maximum rate which can be obtained on through shipments from Minneapolis to Chicago, three times the distance. Hence we see the reason of the great pressure brought to bear upon the St. Paul and Duluth Road last year to advance its rates to the head of Lake Superior, a pressure which the millers, mindful of fixed Liverpool values and of the necessity of cheapest transportation for any profit on export sales, succeeded in resisting. The position of Duluth is not always correctly understood as regards transportation interests. We think of that city as far away from Nebraska, for example, but in truth the distance from Omaha to Duluth is almost exactly the same as from Omaha to Chicago; and of all that great wheat country lying north of Nebraska and Iowa, Duluth is the natural geographical water outlet. It is only a question of time when these conditions will assert themselves, and as the currents of trade flow from the interior to Duluth and to Chicago, the roads between will find it hard to secure competitive traffic at high rates, though increased local business then may take its place.

There is another complication in the problem, the milling-in-transit question. This has many ramifications, but the principle can be briefly stated. It is conceded by all railroads that Minneapolis as a milling centre is supreme. Tariffs must take this into account. If all wheat-carrying roads terminated there, and all flour-carrying roads led from that city, it would be easy to arrange the matter; but the road which brings in the wheat and can carry out the flour, feels, rightly and naturally enough, that the flour belongs to it. The Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul has lines into fine wheat districts. The rate from a wheat station to Chicago is, we will say, 20 cents per 100 pounds, and from this station to Minneapolis it is 12½c. The agreed rate meanwhile from Minneapolis to Chicago is 12½, making a total of 25 cents to Chicago if the wheat was stopped in Minneapolis, ground, and reshipped in the regular way. But the road with feeders grants permission to have the wheat milled en route and reforwarded as flour at the old through rate of twenty cents. It is evident that this saving of five cents per hundred will secure to this road as flour through to Chicago every car of grain which it brings into Minneapolis; and a railroad like the Burlington and Northern, which is dependent upon traffic from Minneapolis straight, and has no branch feeders, will get nothing unless it makes from Minneapolis to Chicago the same rate as its neighbor's proportion of the through rate from the wheat field, which in the case mentioned is the difference between 20 and 12½, or 7½c. per 100 pounds. In addition to this stop-over freight, the milling-in-transit road thinks itself entitled also to a fair share of the "free" grain and flour, for which it hopes to receive the higher 12½-cent rate, a total which the non-transit roads generally think much more than belongs to it. A plan to harmonize these differences was thought out by which the transit road was to redeem its orders when carried by other lines at a certain price, but the old difficulty crops out continually.

To show where this "free" grain comes from, and in general to give a clearer idea of the situation, we present the figures below, taken from the report of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce for 1888:

Statement of flour and grain received at Minneapolis and shipped out in 1888:

Railroads.	Am't rec'd in bushels, flour being reduced to wheat.	Shipped out.	
		Flour, No. of bbls.	Wheat, & flour reduced to wheat, in bush.
C. M. & St. P.....	9,317,485	1,111,005	13,150,030
Omaha..... (C. & N. W)	4,669,505	954,771	5,612,780
Minn. & St. Louis.. (Rock Island)	2,210,382	242,909	1,410,360
Wis. Central.....	1,778	184,500	1,171,530
Manitoba	21,538,735	112,615	879,528
St. Paul & Duluth..	71,730	856,520	3,925,020
No. Pacific.....	5,450,812	4,727	42,282
Chic. St. P. & Kas. City	111,135	865,688	4,749,810
C. B. & N.....	11,437	1,512,198	7,356,370
Minn. & Pacific.. } Soo ..... }	509,010 975,593	245 931,502	29,030 4,309,370
	44,867,600	6,776,680	42,636,100

The excess of wheat over flour shipments on the Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul can be best explained by saying that the wheat probably went to supply local millers, not much of it being exported. The above figures of course include local as well as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through shipments. The strong hold of the Chicago, Burlington and Northern upon the flour traffic is strikingly shown, while nearly all the south-bound lines show an increase of shipments out over supplies in. The great supply of wheat, one-half of the entire receipts, is brought into Minneapolis by the Manitoba, one of the largest wheat-carrying roads of the world. Heretofore this railway has been content with carrying the grain in; lately, however, the company has completed a line of its own from Minneapolis to Duluth, and thus holds the balance of power. It is known that its president is very aggressive, and already there is railroad gossip that a milling-in-transit plan has been talked over to secure for its line out to Duluth a goodly share of the large wheat shipments carried into Minneapolis. The danger of such a system, if put in force on the Manitoba, to the Minneapolis-Chicago roads would be extreme; it would at once put in doubt one-half of the free supplies of wheat which as flour they have been carrying South. Fortunately, other considerations work against the adoption of the plan by that company.

If this be a true statement of the situation in the Northwest, if the competition of the Soo Line and of the lakes must be taken into account, and if milling-in-transit complications threaten all attempts at peace and high tariffs, it would seem to follow that large net earnings between Minneapolis and Chicago on through freight must be problematical for the future. Under the present system of tariff-making, the local rates fall with the through, but this may not always be so. A through-shipment from Minneapolis to New York could be taken at a proportion to Chicago less than the local rate. All through-shipments could be so taken, but are not, for that would ruin Chicago's commission trade in Northwest grain and flour. If any fact stands out prominently in our Western railroad history, it is the fact that Chicago can bend all tariffs and rates to her own needs, no matter what the consequences may be. This is certainly true of the past. Whether it will be true for the future, no one can say.

THE REASONS FOR PRIVATE LAND-OWNERSHIP.

Our article on Henry George's land theories has called forth many letters of protest—so many that we have not sufficient space to publish them. We are accused of unfairness in two points: first, in misstating Henry George's position; and, second, in drawing some inferences from Mr. Cowen's facts about Maryland's oyster-beds which were a little different from those of Mr. Cowen himself. To the second charge we plead guilty. Our inferences did go somewhat further than Mr. Cowen's. That was why we made an article of our own, instead of quoting part of his. But the other and more serious charge, of misstating George's position, we deny *in toto*. We believe that the misunderstanding is on the part of our critics rather than ourselves.

We have received more than one letter containing phrases like this: "Your article on the single-tax theory, or Henry George's land theory, as you prefer to call it." Now we did *not* publish an article on the single-tax theory; and we do *not* prefer to call it the Henry George land theory. We much prefer to call each by its own name. We believe that the confusion between the two has resulted in great mischief. The single-tax idea involves a practical proposition which deserves most serious consideration, and which, within limits at any rate, has a great deal to be said in its favor. The Henry George land theory is an historical generalization which is all but wholly false. The attempt to support a partially true idea by false history involves hopeless confusion.

The Henry George land theory may be stated as follows:

> "Historically, as ethically, private property in land is robbery. It nowhere springs from contract; it can nowhere be traced to perceptions of justice or expediency; it has everywhere had its birth in war and conquest, and in the selfish use which the cunning have made of superstition and law" ('Progress and Poverty,' p. 333).

If this were a true statement of the case—if private property in land were a purely arbitrary institution, the result of force rather than expediency—then each industrial abuse which arises under the present system would furnish at least a prima-facie ground for its total abolition. But this statement is not true. As we showed in our previous article, private property in land has been gradually adopted as being the only way of securing the investment of capital for the sake of remote returns. Under any other system the land was exhausted. Where all agriculture was rude, common ownership could prevail. As improved methods were adopted, the law adapted itself to new technical conditions. The community which did not thus change fell behind in the industrial race. Private property in land, instead of producing the evils of over-population which George charges upon it, postponed the appearance of those evils, by enabling a system to be adopted which would support a larger population with less labor than under the old.

The history of agricultural land tenure repeated itself in mining law. Where the miners roamed from place to place, like tribes in the nomadic state, no rights to land were recognized other than the right of occupancy. When matters had so developed that capital was needed for mining, laws were adopted protecting land tenure. The same process is repeating itself in the matter of oyster culture. As between the two systems which have been actually tried—common use and private ownership—the latter has given far the best results for the community as well as the individual owners. So marked has the constant repetition of this history become that Prof. Wagner of Berlin, after a most careful examination of the whole subject, declares that "the argument against any absolute right of private land-ownership becomes a strong justification of such ownership relatively to present conditions." He also takes pains to say that it is for the sake of the community as a whole, and not for the landowners alone, that the system has proved necessary. And these are not the words of an "orthodox" economist, but of one who is called a Socialist in many quarters.

It must be admitted that the distribution of land under the present system is, in many cases, the result of force and fraud. But the system itself is not. To confuse the two things is a serious fallacy. Any practical inferences which might be drawn under such a confusion would almost certainly be bad. It would be like refusing to arm soldiers with breech-loading rifles, for fear they might fire away their ammunition too rapidly. We are quite willing to admit that a better system than the present one is conceivable. Anything which should give the same incentive to improvements that exists at present, and at the same time avoid the abuses under which we suffer, would be a great advance. A reform which should take burdens off from invested capital and transfer them to the owners of ground rent would be a desirable one. But we believe that the proposal of the more radical single-tax men would do vastly more harm than good.

In the first place, it is not quite true that the security for improvements, even if realized, would be as great an incentive to the owner as the right to the land itself. The "magic of property" is a somewhat indefinable economic factor, but it is none the less a real one.

Second, and far more important, we do not believe that the proposed security for improvements could be made full or complete. The practical alternative in the past has been insecure tenure or direct ownership. We have no doubt that George and his followers sincerely believe that a middle course is possible; but the failure to carry it out in practice is most conspicuous. The various instances cited by Henry George, as showing private ownership to be unnecessary, are cases where improvements were not made on the scale demanded by modern civilization; cases where people could be content to support a smaller population in a ruder state.

George's idea is, that the assessors should tax ground rent 100 per cent., and leave improvements untaxed. But what board of assessors could be trusted to determine where the value of land ended, and where that of improvements began? Any man would be afraid to put too much capital into his land on such terms. If his investment proved less wise than was expected, he would have to bear the whole loss; if it proved wiser, he would enjoy none of the gain. The greater the wisdom with which a man had managed such property, the less protection would he have against the arbitrary action of the assessors in depriving him of the fruit of his good management. If it were the duty of the State to take the whole rent, everybody would be shy of giving it the power to take too much. Any theoretical security for improvements would be practically insecure.

But there is still another and perhaps deeper difficulty. A sudden reversal of precedent, which takes away the security for property of one kind, reacts upon security of every other kind. If people suddenly destroy land titles in obedience to the theo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ries of Henry George, why will they not abolish other titles in obedience to the theories of Proudhon? If one form of property can be confiscated, the practical guarantees for the safety of other forms of property are greatly weakened. The insecurity thus created is a destructive force of tremendous moment.

When George says, "We should satisfy the law of justice, we should meet all economic requirements, by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would sacredly guard the private right to improvements," we are reminded of a recent piece of railroad legislation in one of our States. A law had been passed looking towards decided reductions in rates and fares. It was feared that the effect of this law would be such as to hinder the investment of new capital for building railroads in the State; and to avoid this unpleasant contingency, it was provided that this act should not apply to any railroad hereafter to be constructed. The attempt to confiscate rent and hold improvements sacred has a little more theoretical justification than the attempt to confiscate old railroads and hold new ones sacred; but we do not believe that investors would place much reliance on the promised distinction in either case.

LAWYERS IN POLITICS.

THE trouble in which Sir Richard Webster, one of the ablest lawyers at the English bar, has got himself in the Parnell case is one of the natural results of the general confidence felt in his party that the *Times's* charges were going to kill the Irish question as a disturbing element in English politics. When the *Times* brought out the forged letters, with an air of triumph, it not only made the passage of the Coercion Bill very easy, but seemed to insure the complete disgrace and political destruction of the Irish leaders. Sir Richard Webster, therefore, when he took the *Times* brief, was doubtless carried away by the political considerations which often govern great lawyers in the conduct of politico-legal trials. It is not possible, in fact, for a counsel in such cases as Horne Tooke's, or Queen Caroline's, or Peltier's, or O'Connell's, to live within the four corners of his brief, and take simply a professional interest in the proceedings. He becomes, in spite of himself, the champion of the political party whose fortunes are to be affected by the result, is thrilled by their indignation and inspired by their hopes, and feels as if their future was dependent on his exertions. People understand all this, and are not displeased by it. Sir Charles Russell, an Irishman and an ardent Home-Ruler, for instance, has brought a good deal of heat into the conduct of the defence, and has more than once shocked the judges' sense of decorum by the vigor of his language, but he has not shocked or surprised the British public. They know that he in this trial stands for his party, and has to bear the burden of far graver responsibilities than the guilt or innocence of Parnell or his individual followers. People expect a man in such a situation to glow with something higher than professional ardor; they are disappointed and even disgusted if the man does not under such circumstances get the better of the lawyer.

What has brought Sir Richard Webster to grief, therefore, is not that, although a Government lawyer, he took the *Times's* brief, and not that, having taken it, he brought some of the passion of a politician to the conduct of the case, but that, after he had taken the brief, with a full appreciation of its exceptional political importance, he either wilfully neglected to go to the bottom of the *Times's* case and find out on what it rested, or did go to the bottom of it, discovered its weakness, and trusted to luck to keep the knowledge of it from the defendants. In either case, they say, his conduct was "unprofessional," to use a mild word. His speeches in Parliament before the trial and in the O'Donnell case indicated that he fully believed in the authenticity of the letters, and was not unwilling that the expression of this belief should influence public opinion against the Parnellites. But people ask with amazement, Was it possible that in a case of this magnitude a counsel of Sir Richard's standing kept his eyes fixed on his brief, as if he were trying a horse case, and never asked Soames, the attorney, and Walter, the plaintiff, where they got these letters, or whether they had any reason for believing them genuine except the resemblance of the signatures? Or, if he did ask them, and they told him, is it possible that he neither made nor suggested any inquiries as to Pigott's character? And, finally, what did he mean by calling Pigott on the trial, when he had had for a week in his possession a letter from Pigott to Soames warning him that he could not stand cross-examination? This letter—seeing the terrible nature of the exposure—Sir Richard said in the House of Commons when attacked, that he had communicated five days before Pigott was called, to Parnell's counsel. He had, on Monday last, in the presence of their indignant denials, to confess that he was mistaken; that he and Soames had kept it to themselves, and had produced Pigott just the same, hoping, doubtless, that he would somehow pull through.

We cannot recall a more lamentable situation than that in which this confession places him. It has given the Liberals fair justification for tearing him to pieces, but it has also furnished one of the most curious illustrations on record of the professional solidarity of the bar. There are in the present House of Commons seventy-three barristers and twenty-two solicitors, probably about equally divided between the parties—that is to say, about fifty are Liberals. When the division was ordered the other night on the motion to reduce the Attorney-General's salary, by way of censure, twenty Liberal lawyers walked out of the House before the vote. Had they remained they would have reduced the Government majority to forty-six, the lowest point it has yet reached, and the moral effect would have been very great. But they followed the immemorial custom of the bar in standing by a brother lawyer in trouble—a custom over which the public has vainly grumbled for twenty centuries. There is no other calling in which the *esprit de corps* is so strong, in which professional jealousy so rarely finds outward expression. Doctors are very faithful to each other, but their quarrels are numerous and savage. Clerical bickerings, too, are very bitter and not infrequent, and soldiers and sailors are by no means unwilling to use the knife of criticism on each other. But "brother lawyers" seldom fail each other in times of danger, necessity, and tribulation. The effect of this last display of fidelity on the English voters is said, however, to be very unfavorable to the future prospects of legal candidates for Parliament.

FRANKLIN'S ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION.

WASHINGTON, March 20, 1889.

IT has been a somewhat puzzling question to historical students, how Franklin's proposition for a confederation of the colonies was received by the Continental Congress in 1775. The journals of the Congress, carelessly kept and more carelessly printed, contain no mention of such a proposition. Though "bro't in by committee," as an endorsement shows, no committee was appointed to draft one, no formal report was made upon it when submitted, and no correspondence of the day contains mention of any debate upon the proposals. It was, to all appearances, the individual act of Franklin, informally performed, and the treatment of it by Congress proved how little support it could count upon. Mr. Bancroft merely notes that the proposition was, "for the time, put aside"; and Mr. Bigelow, in his edition of Franklin, says: "What proceedings were had to them cannot be ascertained from the journals; but it is probable that after some debate they were referred to a committee." In his correspondence Franklin makes no mention of his original proposition or its fate, and does not appear to have given it a second thought—an omission suggestive, perhaps, of the determined and convincing opposition on the part of Congress. Even the historical rake of Peter Force—and a very fine-toothed rake it was—did not discover any facts respecting the inception, framing, submission, and final postponement of this plan of union; and, but for the existence of the original manuscript of the articles in the collections of the Department of State at Washington, it might with good reason be doubted if such a scheme had been laid before Congress.

Important as was the intention of Franklin, and original and sweeping as his plan must have seemed to a body but barely launched upon the sea of rebellion, it is curious that so little impression was made upon the members. Had it met with the approval of a majority in Congress, or had it given occasion to a marked difference of opinion, it would have been alluded to in some of the letters that the delegates wrote to the colonial governments, many of which have come to us and form the best source of information on the acts and debates of the Congress. Meagre as are these records, an act of union would surely deserve mention, as a year later the Declaration of Independence was widely discussed while pending before Congress, and, subsequently, the Articles of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Confederation that were based upon the earlier propositions of Franklin.

In looking over a very imperfect file of one of the rarest of colonial newspapers, the *Virginia Gazette*, my attention was attracted by an extract of a letter printed in its columns, as was usual at that time, without names, but containing every evidence of undoubted authenticity :

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Philadelphia to his friend in this city [Williamsburg], dated November 24.

"The confederation is an article mentioned in your letter. Let me give you a state of that matter: in the last congress it was observed by a gentleman, with whose extensive knowledge and abilities the world is well acquainted [*i. e.*, Benjamin Franklin], that when we set out originally upon the plan of a commercial opposition, an instrument was formed by which the colonies were bound to stand by one another till certain ends were obtained. This was the association; that Great Britain had now rendered an opposition by arms necessary, in which case he thought there should be also some bond of union, in writing, that each colony might know how far it had a right to rely on its sister colonies. He therefore introduced a form of confederation to be moulded into any shape thought proper, and merely to set the thing a-going. I do not recollect whether it was read or not, but I well remember that the congress refused to enter into any consideration of it, to send it to the conventions for their approbation, to have it printed for public perusal, to have any entry made in their journals of such a paper being offered, or in any manner to make any order which should imply either approbation or disapprobation of it; it was simply permitted to lie on the table, from which it followed, that if gentlemen thought proper to say anything about it afterwards, it was to be on their own authority individually, and not as proceeding by the order, or even the desire, of congress. Since this, not a word has ever passed in congress upon it, nor had we heard anything without doors till Mr. Inglis informed us such a paper had been solemnly laid before a neighboring convention for them to say whether they would accede to or reject it in the lump, it being said that the alteration or diminution even of a letter would not be admitted; that in the lump they chose to decline it; and that the thing began to make some noise in Virginia. This is the whole I know of it. Though I might not approve of the confederation proposed, perhaps, as it stood (for really I do not remember what it was), yet I am ready openly to declare to the world it is my opinion we ought to be bound together by some treaty of alliance, or confederacy, in which the objects of the war should be defined, the terms of closing it delineated, and the colonies of the union bound to each other to contribute their respective force to obtain these objects, and when these objects were attained, that any one colony should have a right to say they would go no farther." (*Virginia Gazette*, December 13, 1775.)

This letter throws not a little side light upon what has been already published. John Adams, whose sense of self-importance fortunately led him to keep a note-book of the events passing before him, came to the second Congress full of ideas of independence and a union of the colonies—independence of the mother country and a union among themselves. From conversations with the delegates of other colonies, he became convinced that such was the "general sense at least of a considerable majority of that body," and an opportunity for urging his views soon presented itself. Congress assembled on May 10, 1775, and, after a few days spent in organization, was at once confronted with the perplexing question of what the individual colonies should do for themselves, and what might be expected from a general control. For up to this time the Eastern colonies had monopolized attention as the centre of action. It was a New England army before Boston, commanded by provincial officers, and not subject to the direction of Congress. New York applied for "advice" how to "conduct themselves with regard to the troops expected there." That was but an example of what was asked of the Congress, for the inefficiency of the provincial generals before Boston called loudly for a change, and this change the Provincial Congress was only too willing to lay upon the Continental Congress.

With such responsibilities before it, it was a perfectly logical step to regard the possibilities of a more complete union than was then afforded by the Congress acting as a Revolutionary body and meeting the emergencies as they arose. Adams's ideas would thus be received with favor, and were in a measure adopted. The army before Boston was made a Continental army under Continental pay, control, and officers. A Continental treasury was constituted, Continental paper money issued, and in many other ways a spirit of union was manifested. But all this was done without any formal declaration of an independence of British control; and a spirit of moderation, a desire to temporize in the hope of a peaceable reconciliation with the mother country, more than any other single factor, led to the postponement of what should have been the first steps—a declaration of independence, a form of confederation and free ports, according to some such plan as Franklin's propositions embodied. This peace-at-any-price party of that day (and John Dickinson was one of its leaders) received its support chiefly from the Middle and Southern colonies, the New Englanders being the "radicals"; and its strength was sufficient to defeat the measures that were so urgently pressed by Adams.

It was very natural that Franklin should have presented a plan for a confederation. His experience in the Congress of 1754 proved his earnest desire to bring about a union, and his moderation and popular esteem made him a fitting instrument to overcome the opposition of the Dickinson party. Adams had had a sharp altercation with Dickinson, and had very likely gone to Franklin to enlist his aid against his (Franklin's) colleague. At all events, the letter we have just quoted lends a new interest to Adams's noted letter against Dickinson—the "certain great fortune and piddling genius, whose fame has been trumpeted so loudly, has given a silly cast to our whole doings." Congress ought to have had in its hands "a month ago, the whole legislative, executive, and judicial of the whole continent, and have completely modelled a constitution." This was written on July 24, or three days after the Franklin articles had been tabled, and postponed, according to all appearances, through the efforts of the Dickinson party.

It will be curious to know how the draft of these articles, without having received the endorsement of Congress, was submitted to the local legislatures of the respective colonies. The writer of the letter speaks of its solemn submission to a "neighboring convention," and the fact that the draft is printed in the New Jersey archives (vol. x. p. 691), leads me to believe that New Jersey was the "neighboring" colony. This conjecture is further supported by the fact that Charles Inglis, A.M., was one of the signers of the "Address of a Committee of the Church of England in New York and New Jersey to Secretary Hillsborough, relative to the distressed state of the Church in those parts, through the want of Bishops," and probably was from New Jersey. This is, of course, only conjecture, as "Mr. Inglis" is too indefinite a description to pin a positive statement upon. Was the draft sent to any other colony? That it should "make some noise in Virginia" may show that it was sent there also, or had been printed in one of the *Gazettes*.

Fortunately, from an English source, we are able in a manner to trace the matter a little further, and in so doing to add a proof of the authenticity of the letter from the *Virginia Gazette*. The writer of that letter speaks of the individual authority of the members (*responsibility* would have been a better term) for any action on the proposition. The delegates from South Carolina sent it to the Provincial Congress with the following letter:

"The Provincial Congress are to view the following articles as a subject which will be proposed to the Continental Congress at their next session; it therefore becomes the duty of the Provincial Delegates now assembled, to instruct the gentlemen whom they shall make choice of to represent them in the next Continental Congress what they are to express to be the sense of this province. The former delegates beg that this plan may be considered, not as having had the sanction of the Continental Congress, or as recommended by them, or as expressing the sentiments of the Delegates who represented this province in the last Continental Congress, but wish they may be dispassionately debated, and approved or condemned upon their own intrinsic merit."

Unfortunately, the letter is without date or signatures, and may have been a mere circular addressed to all the local legislative bodies. It was accompanied by the articles as prepared by Franklin, and was probably intercepted by the British.

One further step can be given. The proposition was laid before the Provincial Congress, sitting at Hillsborough, on August 21, as a "paper purporting a confederation of the united colonies," and after some debate the following resolution was framed:

"That the committee [of the whole House] have taken into consideration the plan of general confederation between the United Colonies, and are of opinion that the same is not at present eligible; and it is also the opinion of the Committee that the delegates of this province ought to be instructed not to consent to any plan of confederation which may be offered in an ensuing Congress, until the same shall be laid before and approved by the Provincial Congress. That the present association ought to be further relied on for bringing about a reconciliation with the parent State, and a further confederacy ought only to be adopted in case of the last necessity."

It may not be useless to add a word of conjecture as to the author of the letter. The Virginia delegates to the Congress of 1775 were: Peyton Randolph, George Washington, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, Edmund Pendleton, Benjamin Harrison, and Richard Bland. The writer of the letter must have been in Congress in July, when the Franklin propositions were submitted, and probably in November, when the letter was written. Randolph retired in May and died in October, Jefferson being elected in his place. Washington was out of Congress when the articles were submitted, Henry was not reëlected, and Bland and Pendleton had both resigned before the end of August. Lee and Harrison were thus the only two members of the delegation of Virginia who were present at both dates. Lee was quite as much of a "radical" as Adams, and would probably have felt the postponement of the scheme in July with sufficient force to have recalled the circumstances attending its reading—for it was read when presented, as an endorsement by Charles Thomson, the Secretary of the Congress, proves—more definitely than the writer. This leaves only Harrison, a man of known moderation that oftentimes amounted almost to indifference. When Harrison soon after visited the camp with Lynch and Franklin, he was shocked by the extreme democratic views he heard expressed; and General Charles Lee, who never hesitated to blurt out the truth, and could never be accounted a conservative in any direction, made his (Harrison's) surprise the text of a letter to Benjamin Rush,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warning him to repress his extreme sentiments, as unacceptable to the Southern colonies. The matter possesses some interest, and it is to be hoped some of your readers will be able to throw more light upon it.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

A DAY IN ALTENBURG.

LEIPZIG, February 21, 1889.

THE rain was just beginning to fall as I stepped out of the railway carriage at the Altenburg station, and my first care was to inquire when there would come a train to carry me back to Leipzig. Having ascertained this, I took a hasty observation from the station platform, and, seeing nothing remarkable on either hand, determined to follow my fellow-passengers, who were moving off all in the same direction. The feeling of agreeable anticipation that usually accompanies setting foot for the first time in a new place was considerably blunted by this wet reception. When I left Leipzig, an hour before, the sun was shining brightly, and, in spite of the season of the year, there was scarcely a touch of winter in the air. Fortunately, I had brought an umbrella, and, armed with this, I made up my mind to do my sight-seeing in spite of the rain, and get back to Leipzig before evening.

Five minutes' walk, followed strictly in the wake of my car-companions, brought me into full view of the bold rock upon which is built—so fitly that it seems only a natural development of the rock itself—the Schloss of the Dukes of Sachsen-Altenburg. In the hollow at its base, and up the slope of the hillside opposite, lay the old town, a collection of picturesquely distorted old houses, enclosing several church-spires in their midst, and here and there leaving space for a larger building of modern erection. The red tiles on the high-peaked roofs shone through the moist atmosphere with that soft effect so easily reproducible in a water-color. As far as they were concerned, it would have been a pity to have the sun shine. Red tiles look incomparably better in the wet.

Comforting myself with this reflection, I continued along what was evidently the "main street" of this portion of the town, and, after turning a short curve following the outline of the hill, found myself at the driveway entrance to the Schloss. A stately road, very brown when I saw it, with recent gravel, winds up the side of the cliff, fringed by a low stone wall that gives it finish and an even edge against the sky. Two old stone gate-posts, placed in face of the town several feet above where the ground begins to rise, add that imposing something which gate-posts seldom fail to lend a road. In ordinary cases, one accepts them as a sort of guarantee that the road leads somewhere worth going to; they convey a promise and announce a patronage. In this case, where no such guarantee is needed, one having only to look up to see the obvious goal of the journey, they might seem superfluous; but, whether from the association of habit or some other cause, here too they add distinctly to the imposing effect. The effect was inviting as well as imposing, and as I began the ascent, I half expected to gain a region above the level of the rain clouds, where sight-seeing would be made easier. The celerity of my approach, however, proved conclusively the extravagance of such hopes; the elevation, though abrupt, being really very slight. I paused a moment where the road bent, almost doubling on itself, and looked down through the rain on the old town. Altenburg, I have read, is mentioned in a manuscript as old as 980; and though it contains at the present day assuredly no monuments of so early a period, it did not seem so wildly improbable that some of the mustiest of the old houses had originated in the rebuilding that followed the burning of the town by the Hussites in 1430. I say the "mustiest" advisedly, for if there be any specimens of this period still extant, they must, by measure of their solidity, be less picturesque than the more slender and toppling structures, enriched with quaint gables and lattices and striped with cross-timbers, of later erection. Of this latter description are the great majority of Altenburg houses, and where they exist, the view—to American eyes—must always be an interesting one.

The road enters the castle-yard under a square tower which has stood since some time in the eleventh century. Nothing else about this tower is particularly calculated to arouse enthusiasm, and even in respect to age it is surpassed by another tower, this one round, which stands detached on the highest ground of the court, and is alleged to date from the eighth century. From the top of this, one can see (when the rain permits) all the country around, and the approach of all the foes of Altenburg in times past has, without doubt, been heralded from its lookout windows. The various buildings composing the Schloss join hands in an irregular ring about this tower; those to the rear of it being the humble quarters of retainers and the guard of soldiery. A sunken place about in the middle of the court contains a not very limpid pool intended for the watering of horses. On a shaft rising out of the water stands a little old-fashioned stone image of the god Poseidon, trident in hand, who looks, as far as one can make out his expression, thankful to be so safely removed from the muddy element below him. The main building of the Schloss is quite a plain, barrack-like structure, which, on account of its mass, makes a good effect when seen from below, but is uninteresting on closer inspection. The part occupied by the ducal family is all new, the Schloss with the grand *Saal* having been burned in 1864. Not a soul was in sight while I made my observations, save the sentinel at the gateway, and he had retired to a corner sheltered from the rain. I made up my mind to follow his example, but walked first towards the residential portion of the Schloss to have a look at a three-tiered gallery that decorated one of the walls in striking incongruity with the prevailing style of architecture. As I passed by the windows of the ground-floor, an individual in the uniform of an army officer jumped up from his seat, and, advancing to the casement, continued to observe me as long as I remained, with an interest that I could not but consider flattering. Already on climbing the road to the castle, I had remarked, fluttering over the wing nearest the town, the tiny green and white flag that announced the presence of the Duke in his "ancestral halls." Was it possible that his Highness found it so dull on this rainy day that the passing of a casual stranger assumed for him an altogether disproportional interest?

The salvation of Germany on a wet day lies in her cafés. There is hardly any place so small as not to contain a more or less agreeable retreat where excellent beer or passable chocolate, and that national institution the *Fliegende Blätter*, may be obtained. In all but the largest cities, some of the tables scattered about the main room of such an establishment are pretty sure to be occupied at almost any time of day by groups of smokers or card-players, whose utter indifference to the passage of time inspires one with the most delightful idea of the nature of their employment in life. The atmosphere of these places is at all times quiet and civilizing, and they are, for the interested stranger, excellent corners from which to observe particular types and national characteristics. It was with the ideal of such a sheltering corner before my eyes that I came down from the castle into the town again, without having made an attempt to see the interior of the court chapel, of which the long windows and slender spire formed one of the best "bits" in the view of the big pile from below. This I made up my mind to see later in the day, on the occasion of a second visit, when, it was to be hoped, I should be somewhat drier and the weather would have improved. In the meantime, without having to go far on the narrow little street that led up the opposite hillside, I found the place I was seeking. It was literally a corner—a corner room as well as a corner house—and the surroundings were quite as I had foreseen, from the group of interested card-players to the last number of the *Fliegende Blätter* lying open on the table. It was pleasant to be received with a bow and greeting from the affable proprietor, pleasanter still to feel the genial warmth of the great German stove, and yet pleasanter to turn over the *Fliegende Blätter* with one hand, while retaining with the other hold of a cup of steaming hot chocolate. Agreeable, too, when heard from this point of vantage, was the sound of falling rain on the windows, so that one could give up thinking about the weather, or even be willing to have it grow worse. The landlord shifted his seat from table to table, so as to slight none of his customers, and now and then hurried out to give an order, or rose to welcome newcomers. The group of card-players kept steadily on with their game, which appeared to be one of the complicated order—possibly *Skat*, which is so difficult that few Germans play it correctly—and only looked about them when their emptied glasses made it desirable to give a hint to the waiter. Almost every one smoked, and the newspapers of Leipzig and Berlin found a wide circulation; in Germany no one buys a single paper, but goes to a café, where, for the same expense, he can read them all. The whole scene possessed in an eminent degree that quality expressed by the German *Gemüthlichkeit*; there is an English equivalent for the thing, but none for the word.

Comfortable as the thing was, this was not seeing Altenburg, and as the afternoon advanced and the rain continued to fall with gentle insistence, there seemed nothing for it but to start out for another tramp in the wet. This time I walked away from the castle, intending to reach it again in a long circuit through the crooked little town. A few steps from my place of shelter brought me out before a pretty church, more in the English style than any other I had seen in Germany. It had been rebuilt rather than restored (I know not whether in the original style), and looked completely new. The door yielding to my pressure, I walked in, and found the interior even more English than the outside; some dim pictures and tablets, with Old German inscriptions, exposed on the walls of the vestibule, were the only signs of antiquity. After this my walk resolved itself into a chase after towers; new ones were continually revealing themselves to me, and then disappearing again before I could trace them to any foundation in the soil. It seemed as if the streets had been contrived with the subtle purpose of screening these towers from the intrusion of the indiscreet transatlantic visitor. Many of them were large enough to be connected with very capacious churches, yet the disposition of the streets

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about them made it necessary to give up the supposition that such existed. In the course of a long pursuit of these architectural enigmas, I learned that it was perfectly possible to see a tower at the end of a certain street and on turning into that street to find none there. Two brick towers in particular, rising side by side to a considerable height, baffled my endeavors for upwards of half an hour. In America two such towers could exist only for the purpose of indicating a "sacred edifice" somewhere immediately below them; what they indicate in Germany I am unable to say, for after finally coming within a stone's throw of them, I found further approach prevented by a guard of small houses clumped defensively about their base. A flight of stone steps leading to a street on a higher level permitted me to get even closer, but there all trail ceased, and one was obliged to conclude that access to the towers, to all but winged creatures, was denied. The one fine tower which it is easy to approach is that of the pretty Renaissance *Rathhaus*, which stands on the principal square, or market-place, of the town. Here are also some quaint little houses, one of which, having the motto "Verbum Domini timeo" (if I have remembered it aright) carved over the doorway, struck me as being just the cottage for Love to reside in, provided his proverbial abode can be conceived of as situated in a small German town instead of in the green country fields where it belongs.

As I walked back in the direction of the Schloss, my eye was attracted by a handbill announcing that Nicolai's opera "The Merry Wives of Windsor" would be performed that evening at the Ducal Theatre. Curiosity to see the theatre, added to a desire I had already begun to feel to spend a night in this interesting little town, brought me to the hasty conclusion of deferring my return to Leipzig until the next day, when I should have time to visit the Castle in the morning. In order to render this decision irrevocable, I lost no time in purchasing a ticket for the evening's performance. Although willing, on this occasion, to be mildly extravagant, I found myself unable to pay more than a mark and a half, or about thirty-seven cents, for one of the best seats in the house. This was due, of course, to the Duke, whose support of the theatre makes possible the giving of performances at such low prices of admission. It was impossible not to indulge in some quite new reflections on the convenience, in certain cases, of the paternal form of government. There seemed no doubt, at least, that their Duke was a blessing to Altenburgers, for without him they would miss the very tangible advantage of a theatre to go to, besides the less substantial, if no less prized, right to have their town marked with a capital star in the German geographies. The petty German princes have, as every one knows, lost all but the semblance of political power; but the semblance has, after all, a value, and the presence of a court does an immense deal to give an air of distinction to a little provincial city. During the entr'actes, when it is the custom in Germany to promenade in the foyer, I had a chance to catch a glimpse of Altenburg's first society. Its most considerable personages, after the ducal family, seemed to be some officers of rank, whose long uniform coats give their owners as much as possible the figures of spools of cotton. Such a thing as unbending on the part of these individuals is, of course, impossible. A slow walk, allowing a generous clanking of their swords on the uncarpeted floor, and a haughty stare, seemed to suit them best. There was some visiting between the occupants of the boxes, and an interchange of stiff politeness, the frigidity of which may have been the result of the icy atmosphere of the foyer. It seemed to me that that cold foyer, those stiff positions and frozen bows, gave no inadequate idea of the *tristesse* that must pervade a society in which the courtly forms remain when the spirit that created them has disappeared. I thought of the melancholy figure at the window of the Schloss, and hastened, with a shudder, to the warmth below. But if these people bore themselves, as they must, it remains true, as I said above, that their presence contributes a kind of distinction that is missing in larger towns in which there is no court to serve as a focus for the general life.

The inn where I passed the night was, I am sure, the most comfortable in all Germany. Its front windows looked out upon an open place about half-way up the side of the hill, and, from behind, one gazed across a forest of broken roof-tops to where the tall Schloss stood outlined against the sky. Everything in this inn was clean and simple, and, to give an idea of its terms, I believe I paid forty cents for my entire residence there—the use of a big square bedroom over night, and very fair coffee in the morning, with white bread, carefully buttered in advance. The morning was fine, and the picture I got of Altenburg in climbing the hill to the Schloss was one in which all the colors that had been represented the day before by shadings of gray, had been restored to their rightful places in the landscape. A ruddy-faced individual in an old coat, who excused himself in order to change it for one of dark green with liberal bindings of gold lace, took me in charge, and under his guidance I made the tour of the Schloss in approved tourist style.

It was the chapel that I most desired to see, and this I found to be really worth the sacrifice (if it could be considered one) of remaining in Altenburg over night. It was originally the church of the Kollegiatstift St. Georg, founded in the year 1413, and is full of exquisite wood and ivory carving of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The altar and the choir-stall are particularly rich, but the whole chapel offers a beautiful example of that carvers' art in which the German Renaissance found one of its first and most national forms of expression. On the wall of the gallery where the ducal family have their pew are two pictures by Lucas Cranach, of whom numerous examples, indeed, are to be found throughout this part of Germany. Adjoining the chapel is a broad hall, from the walls of which the assembled princes of the house, most of them very beefy and unamiable appearing personages, look down upon modern intruders. The names they bear are not great ones, and are often surpassed by those of the artists who painted them. Beyond this hall extend, in a long line, the state apartments of the Schloss, which, as they contain nothing but some very vivid furniture and the expressionless portraits of a great many "Hoheits," it may be permitted to pass over in silence. To pass *through* them in silence is unfortunately not permitted, your guide displaying a fatal eloquence over Serenities whose deeds or misdeeds do not interest you in the least. The great *Saal*, entirely made over since the fire of 1864, comes at the end of the row, and is shown as a sort of "clincher" to the splendors that precede it. It is an apartment of fine dimensions, but the decoration is lacking in warmth, and for this, or some other reason, the general impression is unsatisfactory. In an outlying portion of the Schloss, which one reaches from the court, is shown a collection of ancient armor, old books and china, historical costumes, models of Altenburg buildings, and curiosities in general. Among the latter is a portion of the rope ladder used by Von Kauffungen when he ran away with the little Saxon princes, Ernst and Albert, in 1455. The kidnapper was discovered and promptly brought back, and the young princes lived to be the progenitors of the two lines of the Altenburg house. Over one of the doors in this museum is placed a bust of the present Duke, of which, my guide informed me, his Highness complains that it makes him look like a pig. Unjust as this may be, it is yet true that many of the Duke's photographs invite the same unfortunate comparison.

In glancing over these lines I find I have made no mention of the Altenburg women. Barbarously ungallant as it is to make them the theme of a closing paragraph, they yet deserve attention on account of two peculiarities—their advanced age and picturesque costume. If there be any young women in Altenburg, I failed to meet with them. That all should be old is a matter for particular regret when one comes to consider the advantages of their costume for setting off the attractions of youth. This consists partly of a short petticoat of dark material, reaching to the knees, and made so uncomfortably tight behind as to resemble the blanket wrapped around an Indian squaw. Black stockings and wooden shoes complete the costume in the downward direction, while above the waist the effect is that of a somewhat complicated arrangement of shawls and colored handkerchiefs. The head is left bare, or at most covered over with a bright handkerchief. It may be that this costume is a mark of distinction only to be assumed by women who have arrived at years of discretion. If so, the age of discretion is attained very late in Altenburg, and the distinction it brings is apt to be accompanied by no inconsiderable degree of poverty, most of these old women going about with big baskets or bundles of wood on their backs. Besides, this hypothesis would not account for the apparent absence of young women from Altenburg. Do they all go away to avoid having to wear the costume? J. K. P.

Correspondence.

MR. WANAMAKER'S CAMPAIGN FINANCIERING.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the *Nation* of the 14th inst., speaking of the "great scandal" attached to the Harrison Administration by the appointment of Mr. Wanamaker as a member of the Cabinet, you say:

"If we are not greatly mistaken, the case is aggravated by the knowledge which President Harrison now possesses of the circumstances under which Wanamaker tried unsuccessfully to raise $400,000 in the last week of the canvass in this city—circumstances which throw a flood of light on the man's real character."

Would it be out of the way for you to state in the *Nation* those circumstances?

A Reader.

Cincinnati, O., March 20, 1889.

[It would not be out of the way; but then our version would not be so readily accepted as Mr. Wanamaker's own, and we suggest that "A Reader" bring the above extract to the Postmaster-General's attention, adding that the *Nation* will cheerfully publish whatever he chooses to reveal about the transaction in question. As a Christian merchant and politician, he ought to avail

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself gladly of the opportunity. That we may not, however, be accused of evading the call made upon us, we will state that Mr. Wanamaker has been recently asked by letter, by a former Cabinet officer, whether it would be agreeable to him to assist in a public inquiry into the $400,000 "strike," and that no reply has been received.—Ed. Nation.]

THE BALLOT IN NORTH CAROLINA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It is somewhat surprising that you should have jumped to the conclusion that because a bill was introduced in the Legislature of North Carolina, proposing to establish an educational qualification for voters, it therefore became a law. As a matter of fact, the new election law of that State contains no educational qualification, that feature of the proposed law having been voted down. Exactly why the Democratic party in North Carolina should have always been so careful of the rights of their political opponents, it is hard to say. Repeatedly they have been in great danger of losing the State, when, by some such perfectly proper restriction as this, they could insure permanent success. The well-known characteristic conservatism of the average North Carolinian is the only reason for such unusual forbearance. No State in the South has suffered more from negro rule than she, owing to the preponderance of the black vote in her eastern counties; yet it has been impossible to induce the Democrats in that State to take any measures to secure their political ascendancy.

Respectfully yours, F. A. Boyle.

St. Simon's Mills, Ga., March 21, 1889.

LAW AND ADMINISTRATION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The letter of Mr. Lionberger in your last issue furnishes a curious illustration of the state of mind of most, even of our educated, people with regard to the force of law. If anything is wrong in society or politics, they will make a great stir and great efforts to have a law passed to amend it, and then rest admiringly from their labors. Whether there is any, and if so what, provision for enforcing the law, never seems to trouble them at all. I was once at a town meeting when an old gentleman said that the school committee ought to do so and so. Somebody answered that they didn't and wouldn't do it. Thereupon our man of law quotes from a statute prescribing it as their duty. "But," rejoins the objector, "suppose they don't do it?" "Why, my dear sir, the statute says they *shall* do it." It is an old story of the English magistrate who, after some outrageous ruling, was reminded by his clerk in a whisper that he could not do that. "But you see I *have* done it." On the 22d of April a vote is to be taken in this State upon a constitutional amendment forbidding the manufacture and sale of liquor. The amendment provides that the Legislature shall *enforce* it by appropriate legislation. Whether the Legislature will pass the laws, or whether, if passed, they will be enforced, are points upon which the amendment throws no light whatever, and the uncertainty of which would deprive it of all force. If only to avoid a monumental stultification, it is to be hoped that the people will reject it.

It is just in this strain that Mr. Lionberger quotes a column, and offers to furnish a hundred more, of opinions of our great jurists and decisions of courts limiting the power of legislatures. All these quotations, however, amount to nothing at all by the side of the simple practical question, Have the legislatures exercised and do they exercise power beyond these limits, and if so, does anybody interfere with their exercise of it? One comment which most foreigners make upon the Federal Supreme Court is, that it has no power whatever of enforcing its decrees against Congress.

To me the most remarkable part of Mr. Bryce's book is his analysis of the State governments, the greed of the legislatures for power, and, at the same time, their feebleness and chaotic impotence as against intriguers and the lobby, and, together with this, the weakness and want of coherence in executive administration. How he got at all this I cannot imagine, as I never can find anybody here who seems to have any realizing sense of it. After saying that a European must ask the question, "How can such machinery work?" he goes on:

"In his attempts to penetrate this mystery, our European receives little help from his usually helpful American friends, simply because they do not understand his difficulty. Light dawns on him when he perceives that the executive business of a State is such as not to need any policy (?) in the European sense, and therefore no harmony of view or purpose among those who manage it. Everything in the nature of State policy belongs to the Legislature, and the Legislature alone."

One remark, with which he sums up this topic, seems to me so just, and at the same time so sagacious, that I must quote it:

"What the legislatures of the worst States show is not merely the need for the existence of a sound public opinion—for such a public opinion exists—but the need for methods by which it can be brought into efficient action upon representatives who, if they are left to themselves, and are not individually persons with a sense of honor and a character to lose, will be at least as bad in public life as they are in private."

There is no more pregnant observation in the whole book than this, that our State governments furnish one of the finest fields in the world for political study—a field which, it must be admitted, is at present, as far as the discussion of principles goes, almost entirely fallow.

G. B.

Boston, March 23, 1889.

NEW MEXICAN SPANISH ANTIQUITIES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Tourists visiting New Mexico find some interest in the fact that they are freely shown places, as well as edifices, to which considerable age (not to say antiquity) is attributed, by writers as well as by the people of the country in general. It may not be out of place to establish the correct dates of such points and structures, since, in regard to accuracy in this respect, considerable looseness has been and is displayed, in type as well as in words. Thus, Santa Fé is variously stated as having been founded in 1550 and 1583. The Chapel of San Miguel is often reckoned as being over three hundred years old; it is even stated by one writer on the past of New Mexico as being a relic from Coronado's expedition, and as dating, therefore, as far back as 1543, although Coronado (notwithstanding the misstatement made by Castañeda) evacuated the country in the spring of 1542. As to the ruined churches of Pecos, San Diego de Jemez, and others, dates are sometimes assigned to them coeval with, if not preceding, Columbus's discovery of America. As far as I know, Mr. John Gilmary Shea was the first to approach accuracy on the subject of dates of New Mexican Spanish structures.

The first Spanish settlement in New Mexico has completely disappeared from the surface. I doubt very much if excavations, even, would yield any traces of the few buildings that constituted the hamlet of San Gabriel de los Españoles, or Yunqus, on the site where now stands the station of Chanita (Denver and Rio Grande R. R.) opposite the Indian pueblo of San Juan, and about thirty miles north of Santa Fé. That first permanent establishment made by Spaniards on New Mexican soil was founded in 1598, in the months of August and September, and was completely abandoned in 1605. Thence, the Spaniards moved over to the site where Santa Fé now stands, selecting that spot for its central position with respect to the most powerful tribes of sedentary Indians, and also for the reason that there was no (inhabited) pueblo in its neighborhood. The former Tano-village of Oga-P'oge was already in ruins in the sixteenth century. The foundation of Santa Fé, therefore, dates back to the year 1605. It remained the only Spanish town north of Parral (in Chihuahua) until after the uprising of 1680. Only after the reconquest, and in 1695, was the second "villa" founded, Santa Cruz de la Cañada, twenty-five miles north of Santa Fé. Albuquerque dates from 1706. Other settlements are of much later date.

In regard to single edifices, the oldest ones have completely disappeared. Not a vestige is found of the old churches of San Felipe, Santo Domingo, and of the parochial church of Santa Fé, finished about 1627. The first two churches named (both after Indian villages) existed certainly in 1605 and 1607. As to the chapel of San Miguel at Santa Fé, it is posterior to 1636. It was the chapel of the Indian families brought up from Zacatecas, who settled on the south side of the Santa Fé River. Burned down in 1680, it was fully restored only in 1710. The so-called palace stands very nearly on the site of the old one, but its restoration is posterior to 1697.

In 1617 there were eleven churches extant in New Mexico, and some of these may be identified as still extant in ruins. They are: the old church of Pecos, dedicated to "Nuestra Señora de los Angeles," the church of San Diego de Jemez, near the Jemez hot springs, the church of San Joseph de Jemez, reduced, though, to a mere heap of rubbish, five miles north of the pueblo of Jemez. Of the remaining eight, barely the sites are approximately known. The first parochial church of Santa Fé has completely disappeared; so have the churches of San Felipe, Santo Domingo, San Juan, Sandia, Taos, Picuries, and Santa Clara. The churches now in use at the pueblos are all modern, the one of Zia, perhaps, excepted. That of Santa Clara dates from 1760, the church at Zuñi from 1780.

The ruins of churches and chapels in the villages around Zuñi are those of structures reared after 1629. Of still more recent origin are the stately and picturesque edifices, equally deserted, that stand in the ruined pueblos about the salt lagunes of the Manzano, south of Santa Fé. It may be affirmed that the churches of Cuaray, Abó, and of Tabira (erroneously called Gran-Quivira) are the most striking monuments in New Mexico. Built of stone, with walls still erect to a height of from ten to twenty feet, and mostly in a location wild and picturesque, not only have they attracted the attention of the traveller, but considerable of mystic lore has been attached to them and to their environment. Still, their past is well known. Ere I became connected with the Hemenway Southwestern Archæo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

logical Expedition, and while yet travelling under the direction of the Archæological Institute of America, I explored Cuaray, Abó, and Tabirá. Subsequent documentary researches, mostly for the new enterprise above mentioned, have developed the simple story of these forgotten missions. Cuaray (dedicated to the Immaculate Conception) was founded after 1630, Abó and Tabirá between 1630 and 1644. The large church at Tabirá, concerning which so many fabulous stories of hidden treasure, etc., have been circulated, is posterior to the latter date, and it was never finished. All these missions were abandoned about 1670 on account of the Apaches, and have never been reoccupied since. There are also rubbish piles denoting the site of the old church at Tajique, in the same region. The edifice dates from the same period.

It may be asserted that there is in New Mexico no architectural vestige of Spanish origin that antedates 1605. Lapidary inscriptions, however, exist of older dates. Mr. F. H. Cushing found, while at the so-called "Inscription Rock" last October, the name of Francisco Sanchez Chamuscado and of three of his companions, together with the year of their excursion into New Mexico—1581; and I also found at the same spot the inscription of Juan de Oñate—1605, April 16. Some of the numerous hieroglyphs at the rock named have been read as giving much older dates, but I can positively assure that there is none anterior to the time of Chamuscado. Neither is it likely that any older one will ever be found at the "Morro," since Coronado and his men took a route which led them far to the south of the place, and at least thirty miles below it.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

SANTA FÉ, N. M., March 5, 1889.

OF THE USE AND ABUSE OF EXAMINATIONS IN COLLEGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: If you will permit me, I would like to present to the readers of the *Nation*, among whom are doubtless many college professors, the results of some study and experience bearing on the subject named above. This experience as an instructor in the college class-room extends through a period of some seventeen years, and has had to do with the subjects of chemistry, rhetoric, logic, ethics, psychology, and political economy.

At the beginning, an oral examination was held on each subject studied, at or near to the close of each term. This was soon found to be very unsatisfactory. A half day of three hours was allotted to the examination. This allowed only fifteen minutes each to a class of twelve, and less than that in a larger class. It soon became apparent that this was little better than a farce. If a student was allowed to succeed, or was made to fail, by such an examination, it was easy to see that it was largely by *chance*. It seems absurd to think that any just knowledge can be got in this way of the student's ability, or of his proficiency in the particular subject. Moreover, it became equally apparent that, as an exercise for the improvement of the student himself, it was nearly, if not altogether, worthless.

The first step consisted in substituting a *written* examination for the oral one; to which again the half day was given. This was a great improvement. Each student was exercised the full half day, and thus much better grounds were gained for judging of his ability and proficiency, and much of *chance* success and failure was eliminated. But it still remained a crude test, even of proficiency, and it was still possible to succeed or fail by accident. Preparation for it led (almost necessarily) to *cramming* in nearly the worst sense of the word. Its value as an exercise to the student is much greater than the oral examination; yet, for reasons suggested above, its value to the student is not great. It leads, however, to one vice that is almost serious enough to condemn it altogether—the vice of *cheating*—of trying to pass the examination by fraud. The successful passing of it is made to mean so much in nearly all colleges that students are drawn into the practice of all sorts of tricks and frauds in the conduct of it. They seek to get a knowledge of the topics of the examination paper beforehand; they make and carry in notes concealed from the professor by every conceivable artifice; they secretly assist one another; they tear up text-books and conceal the fragments about the person in many ways; they laboriously plan to cheat by whatever device may promise success, and it has to be confessed that by these tricks they do too often succeed. All this is bad, very bad, and it is inconsistent with worthy aims and honest work in the pursuit of knowledge and improvement by the student. And it is hardly less bad that, by reason of it, the Faculty are led to so arrange and conduct these examinations as practically to say to the students, "We think you are all knaves." A dozen years ago the writer became weary and heart-sick of such examinations, and set himself to study the problem seriously, with the view, if possible, to find some better way—a way that would be more effective as an examination, and at the same time be consistent with the dignity of worthy aims in scholarship, and in some degree promotive of them; some method that would do away with cheating, and admit of only honest study for preparation, and that would, if possible, wholly eliminate *chance* from the result.

The procedure finally adopted and put into practice in this college may be briefly described as a method of *detailed written reviews* of the various subjects of study. It was introduced by degrees, and tentatively, that effects and tendencies might be carefully studied. The results from the first appeared to be most gratifying; and then the method was extended to new subjects, and it was also made more and more detailed and thorough in the subjects to which it was at first applied tentatively. For ten years now this method has been in full development and use here in a large number of subjects. The writer employs it in all the subjects that he teaches, and teacher and students alike have borne enthusiastic testimony to its worth.

That it may be known just what the procedure is in practice, allow me to describe it in some detail in connection with a particular subject of study. Here is rhetoric—text-book, Whately's 'Elements.' The subject is first gone over carefully in a series of lessons, recitations, and running lectures by the professor, each lesson covering about ten pages of the text. Then comes the review. An average of from twenty to twenty-five pages of the text, and the professor's instructions thereon, are assigned for each exercise. For each exercise a careful selection of the topics under review is placed on the blackboard. To make the *written* exercise still more particular, two sets of such topics are usually made and put on the blackboard, marked No. 1 and No. 2. Each student draws a number, and then proceeds to write up the set of topics corresponding in number thereto. One hour is the time usually allowed for writing the exercise. The professor takes the papers, reads each one carefully, marking all observed errors, and then returns them to the writers. Each student has in this way an opportunity to review the errors he makes, a matter of much practical value to the student.

In ethics the subject is first treated in a series of thirty-four lectures, of one hour each. Each student is required to take notes on these lectures, and he is encouraged to make them as full and accurate as he can. After the lecture he rewrites and improves his notes. In the review the procedure is the same as that described of rhetoric, and the whole course of lectures is gone over in a series of twelve papers. Similarly logic is reviewed in a series of more than twenty papers, and other subjects are treated in like manner. Now, what are the observed results? Note the following. The *student* can hardly fail to get a good knowledge and understanding of the subject; the *teacher* gets an almost perfect view of the ability of the student, and of his knowledge and understanding of the particular subject; *chance* is eliminated—the student cannot succeed, and he cannot fail, by chance or accident; the student makes rapid, often wonderful, improvement in avoiding the errors to which he was at the start subject; he gets a *training* in ready and correct composition, and an amount of it not easy to give him at all, nor so effectually, in any other way; the student's *mental powers* gain a most practical and useful training and development; *cheating* is impracticable and of no avail in these daily continued exercises, and it is apparently seldom even thought of.

These are some of the results which the professors here have been attaining for a dozen or more years; and they are results which have been of inestimable value to the graduates. But here some will probably object that this method means an enormous amount of work for the professors and tutors; and this is true. It does mean a large amount of work—work, too, that some teachers will call drudgery. Let no professor who is sparing of his work enter on this method. But experience here plainly teaches that professors and tutors who are willing to work, and work hard, in the interest of the best training and development of their students for usefulness and practical efficiency in life, may find in this method of procedure a means which they cannot afford to slight.

Yours respectfully, A. G. G.

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, March 18, 1889.

THE EXCAVATIONS AT DELPHI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I should be sorry to stand in the way of any honorable scientific ambition of our people, but I am satisfied that if the directors of our School of Hellenic Studies at Athens understood the position of the proposed excavations at Delphi, it would not be possible for them to enter into the proposed bargain with the Delphini for the privilege of uncovering what may chance to remain of the appurtenances of the Oracle. The present director of the French School here began work in 1861 by purchasing a piece of land and excavating it, and his successor followed with another field. Ever since then negotiations have been going on, not without interruptions, for the complete excavation of the site. The French School has the prior claim, not only by agreement with the Government, but by that courtesy which the American School will not, I am sure, fail in. The French School has not withdrawn its claims, and, without entering into needless details, the entry of a competitor into the field who has the reputation of having millions to throw away, but the greatest indifference about throw-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing them away, has simply had the effect of raising the price of the village from about $25,000, which is the highest value which can be put on it, to $80,000—a species of auction admissible for city sites, but not for scientific research.

The German School, which certainly has greater facilities than the American for the work, refuses to enter into any such competition, recognizing the moral claims of their sister institution. The present aspect of the matter is this: the French School has several times been accorded the concession of the excavations, and originally the Greek Government was to expropriate the land, receiving for the Greek museums all the results of the work; the French paying all the expenses and getting all the honor. The later conditions are, that the diggers shall pay for the land and the work and the honor whatever the Greeks of Delphi see fit to demand; and as the Americans are supposed to have more money, they are asked three times what the land and village are worth for the privilege the excavations will confer. The upset price of the village is, as I have said, $25,000. The excavations will not remove the whole of it, but if there are two competitors in the market, not only the whole will be insisted on, but the exorbitant price now demanded will be maintained, and what beyond, no one can guess who has not had some experience of the way the Greek peasant looks at every object of antiquity. In Foucart's last campaign the people of Delphi made an elaborate calculation that he had made by the publication of the inscriptions found not less than 14,000,000 francs. Imagine the effect of such views on the estimates to be placed on every concession made or to be made when the Government itself does not control the conditions; and this is impossible in the present state of Greek politics, for any favor shown the foreigner is set down as want of patriotism, and will create embarrassments for the Ministry.

But this is a secondary consideration, and will, I hope, be so regarded by our people. The essential is, that the French School has by courtesy a claim not to be interfered with under the circumstances, and our appearance in the field as competitors only increases the difficulty for whoever does the work. The site is offered for competition under conditions that ought to prevent the American School from accepting it. There are plenty of sites which are not so preëmpted, and where excellent work can be done. Yours truly, W. J. Stillman.

Athens, March 2, 1889.

MR. COLE'S WOODCUTS IN THE *CENTURY*.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The engravings by Mr. Cole which are appearing from month to month in the *Century* as illustrations of the "Old Italian Masters" have hardly attracted the attention they deserve.

Nothing that has yet been done by the American engravers on wood who, during the last few years, have carried their art to the highest excellence in reproducing the characteristic qualities of the work which they have had to copy, has surpassed in exactness of delineation, in refinement and vigor of execution, and in sympathetic rendering of the subtlest features of the original, these remarkable productions of Mr. Cole. The variety of the technical methods of which he shows himself master has enabled him to reproduce with equal success work as widely different in motive and style as the mosaics of Ravenna and the panel paintings of the Florentine artists of the fourteenth century.

No engravings hitherto existing of the works of early Italian art give so much of the essential spirit as well as of the manner of painting of these works as this series of Mr. Cole's. It is, therefore, invaluable to the student or the lover of the art of a period when the poetic genius of Italy was inspired with the first flush of conscious power, and was endeavoring to express itself in forms of beauty which it was not yet able completely to realize, but which, in their very simplicity and imperfection, often possess a charm beyond that of the more complete performances of a later and more sophisticated age.

Mr. Cole's skill is so masterly, and his artistic sympathies are so broad, that there is no doubt that he will reproduce the work of the painters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries not less admirably than he is doing that of their forerunners.

His notes upon the pictures which he copies are full of interest in connection with his engravings, and Mr. Stillman's papers which accompany the illustrations are excellent.

There is much more to be said of these engravings, but I have said enough, for the present at least, if my words induce those of your readers who have not hitherto paid attention to them to recognize their extraordinary merit and exceptional interest.

Your obedient servant,
Charles Eliot Norton.

Cambridge, March 24, 1889.

BENJAMIN VAUGHAN AGAIN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Apropos of Mr. Benjamin Vaughan, it may be interesting to some of your readers to know that he was the cause of Dr. Rice's making the first American reprint of Captain John Smith's 'General History' (Richmond, Va., 1819, 2 vols., 8vo). A young Virginia lawyer, Mr. Francis Walker Gilmer, whose letters are being edited for the "Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science," spent the winter of 1814-15 in Philadelphia, where he became intimate with Mr. John Vaughan, whom your correspondent Mr. Kerr so pleasantly described in a recent number of the *Nation* (No. 1237). On the recommendation of this gentleman, Mr. Gilmer (who was quite a scholarly young man) began a correspondence with Benjamin Vaughan upon matters of antiquarian interest. From the four letters of Vaughan's that have been preserved, we see that he recommended Gilmer to study Smith, and even sent him his own copy of the 'General History' (London, 1629). If my memory is correct, the suggestion of the propriety of an American reprint came from Mr. Vaughan; at any rate, he was warmly in favor of the project, and so Gilmer induced Dr. Rice, a well-known Presbyterian clergyman, and the editor of a Virginia religious magazine, to undertake the publication of the reprint from the copy Mr. Vaughan had lent. It may be remarked that Mr. Gilmer afterwards rendered great service to his State by securing Long and Key and Dunglison for the first faculty of the University of Virginia.

Now, if we recall the eloquent tribute to Captain Smith which George Long introduces at the end of his biographical sketch of Marcus Aurelius, and in which he says, "Smith is almost unknown and forgotten in England, his native country," we shall have, I think, a reason for holding a high opinion of Benjamin Vaughan's scholarly attainments.

Your obedient servant, Wm. P. Trent.

The University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., March 20, 1889.

THE ORIGIN OF *TOPSYTURVY*.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The Rev. Professor Skeat, in the Supplement to his *Etymological Dictionary* (1884), speaks of this common word as being "practically unsolved." Any new facts, or arguments based on facts already known, tending to account for its development cannot, therefore, but be welcome to those who are interested in the history of our vocabulary.

Among English locutions convertible with *topsyturvy*, and beginning with its first verbal element, the oldest which I have made a note of is seen in the following verses:

"His folk went vpto lond, him seluen was the last.
To bank, ouer the sond, plankes thei ouer kast.
Als William ther on suld go, he stombled at a nayle;
Into the walse tham fro he tombled *top ouer taile*."

So wrote, about 1330, Robert Mannyng, of Brunne: *Peter Langtoft's Chronicle* (ed. 1810), p. 70. With others, the author of *William of Palerne* (about 1350) l. 2776, and John Barbour (1375), in his *Bruce*, VII., 455, have the same phrase. In the *Chevelere Assigne*, of the end of the fourteenth century, we find, in l. 320, the term *topseyle*, as to which Mr. H. H. Gibbs pertinently asks: "Should it be, perhaps, 'topteyle'?"

In the anonymous *Cronycle of Englonde*, which was repeatedly printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there occurs, in Pynson's edition of 1510:

"And our stakes made theym *toppe ouer terue* eche one ouer other, that they laye on hepes two speres lenthe of hyghte." Sig. aa 1 *v*.

Having come upon this passage, I traced it back, and found this reading of it in Caxton's edition of 1480:

"And oure stakes made hem *toppe ouer terue* eche on othir, that they lay on hepes two spere lengthe of heyhte." Sig. t 6 *v*.

The St. Albans edition, referred to 1483, exhibits, at sig. G 2 *v*., "made them *toppe our terue* eche on our othir," in which the second *our*, "over," is represented by a contraction. *On*, as in Caxton, is "one."

Probably from the Anglo-Saxon *torfian* came, *torvien* intervening, the verb *terven*, *terve*, the old past participle of which was not too archaic for Caxton, who, supplementing Higden, has, in 1582, "The Yomanrye had theyr hosen *teruen* or bounde bynethe the knee, hauynge longe Iackes." Trevisa's Translation of Higden's *Polychronicon* (ed. 1595), fol. 330 *r*. Here, as in other places where it is met with, *terve* seems to have the sense of "to fall," or else that of "to be made to fall," "to throw down," "to cast."

In two passages quoted above, it may be that, in *ouer othir*, *ouer* is pleonastic, much as the first *out* is in, "Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye." Otherwise, *overterve* is intransitive there. Caxton, however, clearly makes the verb, with him part of a strange compound, transitive; and it appears that, employed thus, it cannot have been very unusual in his time. An author who was still living in 1465, again and again has the infinitive *overterve* and the past participle *overterved*. See John Hardyng's *Chronicle of England* (ed. 1812), pp. 47, 186, 408, and pp. 59, 60, 75, 155, 398.

Of *topsyturvy* no earlier instance has, to my knowledge, been produced than that which, in my *English Adjectives in -able* (1877), I cited from William Roy and Jerome Barlowe (1528), whose spelling is *topsy tervy*. But it would be highly rash to assume that it was of their devising. In 1530, Palsgrave recorded the form *topsy tyrvy*. A little later the word became very popular.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us now turn to a phrase much more ancient than *topsyturvy*, and one with it in import. Soon following, it seems, *up to down*, appeared, betimes in the fourteenth century, or before then, *up swa doune*, which was shortly changed to *up so down*, *upsodoun*, and *upsodon*. Richard Rolle de Hampole (about 1340), the oldest authority for *up swa doune*, has also *up that es down;* and a single instance of *up tho so downe*, "up then," etc., in a book printed in 1483, has fallen in my way.

The corruption *upsedoun*, as old as Wycliffe, is found, written *upsedowne*, in Lord Berners's *Froissart* (1523), in John Rogers's *Bible* (1537), and elsewhere. And afterwards came *upsedown*, *upsydown*, and *upsyedowne*. Among the illiterate, in some parts of England, one may, even now, often hear *upsedown;* a curious survival, if not, as is more probable, simply the result of slurring, in utterance, *upside down*.

As I pointed out in 1877, Alexander Barclay, in his *Shyp of Folys* (1508), and not only there, substitutes, for *up so down*, *up set downe*. This new form was accepted, in 1540, by Richard Hyrde, in 1559, by Bp. Thomas Cooper, and, in 1569, written *upset downe*, by James Sanford, who has also *topset downe*. Carelessness of pronunciation, or else a fancy about etymology, looks like a sufficient reason for Barclay's invention or adoption.

As was the genesis of *up set downe*, so, presumably, was that of *upsyde downe*. Palsgrave knew the latter in 1530; Bp. Coverdale (1535) and John Rogers (1537) used it in rendering *Psalm* cxlvi., 9; and it was soon permanently established. That *up so down* is an "ignorant spelling for *upside down*" is the ludicrously unhistorical assertion of the Rev. J. H. Todd, glossing the *Apology for Lollard Doctrines*.

That, in imitation of *upse*, from *up so*, was produced *topsy*, is no perilously hazardous conjecture. *Top so*, corresponding to *up so*, has not, so far as I am aware, yet been discovered.

The contention that *turvy* is to be explained through *toppe over terve*, or something very like it, receives support from Row and Barlowe's *tervy* and Palsgrave's *tyrvy*. The verbs *terve* and *overterve* were no longer familiar in their day; and their *tervy* or *tyrvy* is no more of a liberty than what we see taken, a few years afterwards, in *arsy-versy*, which had become common when Nicholas Udall employed it in 1542, in *howrley burlei* (1534), *whorle borle* (1552), "*hurly-burly*," and in Sir Thomas Wilson's *hittie missie* (1553).

I have, now, at least disabled all the etymologies of *topsyturvy* that I am acquainted with. These are numerous enough, and no less numerous than futile, as I evinced on a former occasion. At present it will suffice, then, to notice two of the latest to which well-known writers have signified their adhesion; their judgments illustrating, by opposition, the prudence of postponing dogmatism to investigation. The expression, according to Dr. Trench, is a shortening of *topside the other way*. Confronted with such legislative finality as attaches to archiepiscopal cocksureness, we are, as it were, challenged to believe that "there is no doubt of the fact"; and Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood is quite as peremptory with reference to the equivalent *top side t'other way*. Mr. T. L. Kington Oliphant (1886) is equally certain in favor of *top side turf way*, as its original. Yet one is warranted in strongly questioning, if not in almost denying, that either *side*, or *the other*, or *turf*, or *way*, was ever a constituent of it.

If only for its oddity, the following passage is worth quoting:

"Let all the misticall drifts and ambiguous designes of inveigling man turne *topsoltiria*, or upside downe, I care not." William Lithgow, *A most delectable and True Discourse* (1623), p. 202.

Was Lithgow here wronged by his printer? Provided he did not mean, after his crazily emancipated fashion of coining words, to annex the Italian *sotterra*, "underground," to *top*, it is beyond me to suggest the source of his *topsoltiria*.

Among variations of *topsyturvy* which I have come across are *topset torvie* (1558), *topsetturvie* (1569), *topset tirvi* (1573), *topse torve* (1579 and 1581), *top syd turvie* (1582), *top turvye* (1582), *tupsiturvie* (1640), *turvy topsy* (before 1687), and so on. *Topside turvey* was patronized, as by others, by Thomas Kyd (1594), Spenser, and Bp. Richard Mountagu. Charles Cotton (1664) writes: "Then turning *topsey* on her thumb." So much for the adverb.

Thomas Phaer (1562) and Joshua Sylvester (1606) have the transitive verb *topsy turn*, *topsie-turn;* Thomas Heywood (1613), *topsiturn*. Florio wrote, in 1603: "Confounding and *topsieturving* the visage of all things." Samuel Richardson (1740), Mr. Carlyle, the first Lord Lytton, and Mr. Bernard Cracroft (1868), also use *topsyturvy* as a verb transitive. Southey (1807) has the gerund *topsey-turveying*.

Chapman (1612) has *topsyturvy* as an adjective; and so have Dean Swift (1703), the Rev. F. E. Paget (1856), and Dr. J. H. Appleton (1878).

As a substantive, *topsyturvy* is used by the translator of *Francion* (1655), by Mr. John Morley (1878), and by "George Eliot" (1879).

Two quotations are also at hand for *topsyturveydom*, two for *topsy-turvyism*, and one *topsy-turveyfication*. All are of our own day.

It may be as well to mention, in conclusion, that I first proposed to connect *topsyturvey* with *toppe over terve* in this journal, June 15, 1882.—Your obedient servant, F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, November 10, 1888.

In place with the quotations from Daniel Tuvil and the Rev. John Hales, in col. 2 of p. 336, *supra*, is that which here follows:

"He knew . . . That his Counsels, which course soever he tooke, would not bee by them *eliminated*." Henry Seile, *Augustus* (1632), p. 79.

P. S.—In p. 96, col. 3, a little below the middle, read, instead of "stands," "does not stand." In the same col., near the foot, substitute "my fuller" for "any fuller." F. H.

FEBRUARY 12, 1889.

Notes.

FREDERICK WARNE & Co. will supply the American market with a new series of standard and popular works in all departments of literature, issued at intervals in handy pocket volumes, and to be called the "Victoria Library." A volume of 'British Oratory' will lead off.

G. P. Putnam's Sons make further announcements for the spring as follows: 'The Ideals of the Republic; or, Great Words from Great Americans'—the Constitution, Washington's inaugurals and Farewell Address, Lincoln's inaugurals and Gettysburg Address, in the Nuggets series; 'The Constitutional History of the United States, as Seen in the Development of American Law'—papers by Judge Cooley, Henry Hitchcock, Geo. W. Biddle, Chas. A. Kent, and D. H. Chamberlain; a translation of Dante's 'Convito,' by Katharine Hillard; an 'Essay on Money,' by James Platt, from the 19th English edition; and 'Seven Thousand Words Often Mispronounced,' by Mr. Phyfe.

Parallel with the first of the above announcements of the Messrs. Putnam is an "Old South Leaflet" containing Washington's inaugurals and the addresses of 1789 and 1793. The Farewell Address and Lincoln's inaugurals have already been published in the same useful series (D. C. Heath & Co.).

The new volume of the 'Musical Year-Book,' published in Boston by G. H. Wilson, 152 Tremont St., will appear about May 20. It is the sixth issue of the series.

The new edition of De Gubernatis's 'International Dictionary of Writers of the Time' (*Dizionario Biografico degli Scrittori Viventi*) is to appear in French as well as in Italian (Florence: Louis Niccolai; New York: F. W. Christern).

Gustav Fischer, Jena (New York: Christern), has undertaken publication of a practical 'Dictionary of Political Science' (Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften). It will be very strong on the statistical side and on the bibliographical, and complete lists of the works of eminent political scientists will accompany the brief notices of their lives. The work will be brought out in parts, and will require three years for completion.

We have received the prospectus and sample sheets of the 'Century Dictionary,' which will begin to be distributed to subscribers in May. Prof. W. D. Whitney has been the editor-in-chief, with a singularly strong corps of assistants. As our readers have been apprised, this new work is of the cyclopædic kind, and it is estimated that it will contain no fewer than 200,000 words. The illustrative quotations will be correspondingly numerous, and the pictorial definitions from 5,000 to 6,000. Of these cuts it is not too much to say that they surpass anything ever attempted in a similar publication. The column is a trifle wider than that of the 'New English Dictionary' of the English Philological Society, and also longer, and in forsaking the old-style letter we believe the Century Co. have produced a more legible text, save in the one particular of Arabic numerals. We can specify nothing more at this time, except that the Dictionary will make six volumes quarto, and will be finished in two years.

A tentative 'List of the Issues of the Press in New York,' 1693-1752, by Charles R. Hildeburn, has been reprinted from the *Pennsylvania Magazine of American History*.

From Macmillan & Co. we received some time ago 'The Civilization of Sweden in Heathen Times,' by Prof. Oscar Montelius of the National Museum, Stockholm, translated from the Swedish by the Rev. F. H. Woods. The first part of the original ("The Stone Age") was published in 1874, and a second edition of the entire work appeared about four years later. It has since been made accessible to scholars generally through a German translation; but the English translator states that the volume before us embodies the results of researches made by Dr. Montelius down to the year 1888, and that the proof-sheets have been revised throughout by the author. The reputation of Dr. Montelius is so well established among archæologists that it only remains for us to say that the general reader will find much to interest him in this account of prehistoric life in Scandinavia. The book is illustrated with numerous woodcuts of arms, implements, ornaments, etc., of flint, bronze, iron, silver, and gold.

A valuable addition to the literature of domestic affairs is Catharine Owen's 'Progressive Housekeeping' (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.), which seems to us the very book of books for a young woman to absorb when she be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comes mistress of a home. It is not a cook-book, though containing some suggestions in that line, but a treatise upon the best methods of doing all manner of housework; for example, we are told with great exactitude how to manage the kitchen fire, to scrub tables, wash windows, sweep without letting the dust fly, etc. The book makes a specialty also of plans for the timing and arrangement of work, more particularly in small households.

The bound first volume of *Belford's Magazine* (Belford, Clarke & Co.) revives our first impressions of this unique periodical, in which literature and eternal enmity to protection have formed a partnership. Neither department has swamped the other, and the readers enticed by the belles-lettres side can hardly fail to be affected by the economic propaganda carried on by such writers as Prof. Sumner, Mr. R. Q. Mills, J. G. Carlisle, T. G. Shearman, Frank H. Hurd, Henry George, and many another besides these and the industrious editor himself, Mr. Donn Piatt. Mrs. Piatt furnishes some of the best of the poetry, and there is an agreeable diversity of literary miscellany.

The renovated *Cosmopolitan Magazine* for April adjusts its contents to the approaching centenary festival in this city, but its most significant feature is the first of a series of articles on the anti-slavery struggle, or "The Great Agitation." Mr. Moncure D. Conway has the floor to tell of Southern abolitionists, which he does entertainingly enough, but without precision or much more than a superficial glance. It is surprising that, as a Virginian, he should make no mention of the Rev. George Bourne's anti-slavery ministry in that State, and of his concentrated Bible argument against the system, 'The Book and Slavery,' in which for the first time the duty of immediate emancipation was specifically enforced, and which had more effect in breeding abolitionists than all other Virginian publications put together. The article closes with some autobiographical glimpses. The proof-reader has converted Dr. Gamaliel Bailey of the *National Era* into "Dr. Griffin Bailey."

Scribner's railway articles are to be succeeded in June by a new series on "The Practical Applications of Electricity," by competent writers, with helpful illustrations.

An American edition of the illustrated monthly magazine, *Artistic Japan*, is to be sent out from No. 220 Fifth Avenue, back numbers to date being furnished, after which the publication will be simultaneous on both sides of the water. It is a "journal of arts and industries, for the use of the artist, the amateur, the manufacturer, and the artisan," conducted by S. Bing. Each part contains ten royal quarto colored plates, in addition to the designs incorporated in the text. These are all promised to be of the same excellence as in the European edition.

We have received sample sheets of the first number of a new quarterly historical review, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*. The editor is Dr. L. Quidde of Königsberg; the publisher, J. C. B. Mohr of Freiburg i. B. According to the prospectus, the *Zeitschrift* will contain: (1) Essays on the mediæval and modern history of Europe, including papers on historical method, historiography, etc.; (2) Minor original contributions and extracts from sources; (3) Papers on the historical literature of the different countries of Europe; (4) Notes and news concerning learned societies, recent publications, works in preparation, etc.; (5) A systematic bibliography of German history. Judging from the sheets before us and from the list of able contributors given in the prospectus, the new *Zeitschrift* promises to rival, if not excel, *Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift*.

Two articles in the *Harvard Law Review* for March arrest attention, viz., Judge Cooley's on the "Comparative Merits of Written and Prescriptive Constitutions," and E. Irving Smith's on "The Legal Aspect of the Southern Question."

The principal article in the March number of the *Library* is the interesting account of the Brothers Foulis and early Glasgow printing, read before the Library Association, last September, by Professor Ferguson. Chancellor Christie's paper, "A Dynasty of Librarians," briefly sketches the fortunes of the Bignon family, whose members ruled almost uninterruptedly for a century and a half, from 1642 to 1783, the Royal Library of France—a dynasty without parallel in the history of libraries. Mr. Garnett has a note on the Livy of Pope Alexander the Sixth, now in the British Museum, and Mr. Duff of the Bodleian reports the probable discovery of a hitherto unknown English printer of the fifteenth century. In this number the foibles of the Theoretical Librarian furnish the subject for a clever character sketch by Theophrastus Junior.

Sun and Shade for March has a photogravure portrait of Mr. Blaine, and the usual variety of still-life scenes, copies of paintings, studio compositions, etc., none of a very striking nature, yet displaying well the range of the process.

The Spanish bull-fight mostly occupies *Paris Illustré* for March 16 (International News Co.). Three colored and sundry other large plates accompany the letterpress.

A comely *Revue Française*, monthly, devoted to literature, art, and science, is launched this month at 39 W. 14th St. and 851 Sixth Ave. (Boston: Carl Schoenhof). M. L. Boisse is the editor.

A lively debate raged recently in the London *Athenæum* over the exclusive right to the initial *Q.* as a literary mask. Consideration is certainly to be paid to initials, arbitrary or genuine, which are commonly identified with a particular writer. The editor of the *Tribune*, for example, should hardly (nor do we believe he would) permit a Washington despatch to be signed "J. G. B.," even if the sender chanced to be some James Gordon Bennett and not our Secretary of State. In Shaksperian circles "H. H. F." suggests one name above all others, and we think that the editor of *Shakespeariana* should not have set a trap for the unwary by allowing another contributor to appropriate Mr. Furness's trade-mark, as he did in his last issue. We fell into this trap ourselves, and can confess it without mortification, yet not without regret at our false attribution.

Prof. Antonio Favaro of the University of Padua, who is in special charge of the national edition of the works of Galileo, sends us an alphabetic and topographic index of the astronomer's *commercio epistolare*, to stimulate search for letters written by or addressed to him. That from our American archives, or libraries, or private autographic collections, Prof. Favaro can expect to draw any material, we greatly doubt; but we cheerfully spread the intelligence of his quest. He will publish what is sent him, and acknowledge the source.

—The April *Harper's* naturally puts foremost the subject of the approaching centennial celebration in this city, and brings very useful illustrations of the changes of the century in its reproductions of old prints of Washington's triumphal progress from Mt. Vernon to the seat of the new Government. These prints themselves remind us of the modesty of our beginnings, and Mr. McMaster's text harmonizes with them. He does his best to make the reader realize the comparative smallness of our territory, the scarcity of the population, and the confusion of the political life of the jarring members of the Union, and so to impress on the mind the difficulty of the great task which Washington took upon himself. Mr. Moncure D. Conway also contributes some hitherto unpublished details of Washington's life, with new letters; but these regard almost exclusively his family and kindred. The most interesting of them is his letter of advice to a nephew, instructing him in what way to get on in the world, what clothes to wear, and what society to frequent. The conclusion of the epistle, in which he makes the continuance of his affection and good offices conditional on the nephew's conduct, is a striking example of the way in which parental and semi-parental obligations were interpreted a hundred years ago. Mr. Theodore Child continues his Parisian studies with an entertaining account of the history of the café, accompanied with several effective cuts. The café is almost a part of the history of the development of the French Revolution — the salon of the present century; and in connection with the papers upon Washington, its description here recalls the contrast, which must occur to many minds, of the centenary of '89 in the two countries which began the course of democratic freedom together. A description of Abbotsford, from the pen of Sir Walter Scott, is the literary curiosity of the number. Tangier and Morocco are described in the French impressionist manner, the growing influence of which in papers of travel is, perhaps, partly due to its fitness for magazine-work; and there is a bunch of beautiful engravings of diving birds.

—The office-boy has evidently had full swing in preparing the index to the ten volumes of the *Andover Review*. He has not only never gone behind the label of the article, but, for want of collocation of the various papers on the same subject, a person who relied upon the index would fail to find the greater part of them. Thus, to all appearance, there has been but one article each on the "American Board" and the "Andover Theory of Probation." Among the articles on Mormons are *not* those entered under "Utah, Church—State" and "Utah, Conquest of," though they are by the same writer. A person seeking information about Bach would find it, but if he looked for Händel, who is the joint subject of the article, he would find nothing. The same remark applies to "Arnold (T.) and the Oxford Movement," and to "Tolstoi and (M.) Arnold." If he looks for Atonement, he will find one article, but not a second, equally long, because, though its title and length are the same, it is one of a series, and is entered only as a sub-title under "Progressive Orthodoxy"; nor a third, because it is only the joint title with "Blood Covenanting." According to the index, not one article has been printed about Christ or Jesus. It is needless to say that there were several, but each has been carefully hidden under the caption, "A Bible Study." One article about the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is entered under that title, while another is discoverable only under "Bryennios." "Church Problems in Germany" is entered under C, but the "Religious Condition of Germany" is under G, and "Theological Tendencies in Germany" under T, with no cross-reference in either case. George Eliot, Victor Hugo, and Matthew Arnold are alike entered under the first name, and "Judge Allen" under J. There is nothing about Noyes (W. H.), but there is an entry,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Additional Documents in the Case of Mr. W. H. Noyes." There is an article entered as "Question Restated, The," without anything to indicate what question, and another as "False Test, A." "A Roman Martyr," "A Scotch Mystic," "A Sturdy Christian," are vague enough titles to suit the most exacting office-boy, as is also "A Typical Novel." There is no list of authors, but, to make up for this, the entries are arranged in two alphabets, according as the articles are by the editors or by contributors.

—Of all the correspondents who have written to inform us that the fact of Shakspere's residence in St. Helen's Parish (*Nation*, No. 1236) was no discovery of ours, no one has hit on the worm-hole from which we plucked our account of the indenture which proves this fact. It was a corner where no one would look for anything Shaksperian, viz., in 'The Genealogical Dictionary of First Settlers of New England, showing three generations of those who came before 1692,' by James Savage (vol. ii, p. 528). Could a miser hide his hoard more adroitly? Savage claims that he found the statement, and we naturally supposed ourselves the first who chanced to notice his finding, especially as we did not see it in Phillipps. But we have since read the indenture *in extenso* in Hunter's 'New Illustrations of Shakespeare' (vol i, p. 77), published after the date of Savage's find. Hunter says: "In the course of any researches of my own, only one document [the indenture] has presented itself which is entirely unknown, containing a notice of Shakspere during his London life." Whether the indenture was shown to Savage by Hunter or to Hunter by Savage, it seems impossible to determine. Neither alludes to the other. That Mr. Phillipps knew nothing of the indenture, we must believe until some allusion to it is pointed out in his works. Such ignorance on his part would have been in keeping with what a correspondent writes, that "the prejudices and eccentricities of Mr. Phillipps hindered as much as his enthusiasm helped his work; that he would not institute inquiries in counties far remote, nor would he authorize a thorough search after those who must have inherited and divided the possessions of Elizabeth Hall," etc. Nor could such ignorance surprise us, for, in 1884, we heard him declare that he had never seen Schmidt's 'Shakespere Lexicon,' which had already been published for ten years.

— On March 5 was performed in Berlin for the first time, at the Royal Theatre, under Henrik Ibsen's supervision, his latest drama, "The Lady of the Sea." The story is a fantastic one, of a married woman grown morbid because of a mariner to whom, in her own home by the sea, she had formerly plighted herself, and whom she supposed dead before marrying, yet now fears to have appear and make rightful claim of her affection. He turns up, in fact, in the course of the play, and would make off with her, but this destroys the spell he has hitherto laid upon her conscience, and she remains by her husband. A correspondent writes us:

"In this play Ibsen shows his power as a dramatic poet to the best advantage. The way in which the interest is aroused from the very beginning, and is constantly heightened to the end; the fact that every act ends with a scene which makes us expect the beginning of the next act with the greatest impatience; the skill with which all figures are grouped about the central one; the dialogue which so subtly reveals the character of each speaker; the beautiful scenic background (a large part of the action takes place out of doors near the mountains of the Norwegian fjords), which helps to increase the poetic mystery in which the whole piece is wrapped—all these things prove Ibsen to be a master of dramatic technique. But the play has more than technical merits. Ibsen shows a wonderful insight into the workings of the human mind in the description of *Ellida's* condition. She speaks in a curious, often only half-intelligible way; she loses her interest in her surroundings, and spreads an inexplicable atmosphere of unrest about her. One is made to feel that her condition is rapidly growing worse, and yet this is so carefully done that it would be difficult to mention any one passage which proves this statement. The author is no less admirable in showing how *Ellida's* unnatural state of mind is warping the characters of her stepdaughters. *Bolett*, the elder, is a kind-hearted and earnest girl of about twenty, whose ambition it is to learn something, and to have a larger field of action than she can find in their little town. She cannot discuss her plans with her father, whose thoughts are too much taken up with his wife; much less can she speak about them with her stepmother; she grows dissatisfied, and at last consents to marry a man whom she does not love, simply because she has reason to think that her long-cherished hopes will be realized through him. *Hilda*, her younger sister, is a fiery and impetuous creature, who grows miserably bitter and cold from lack of sympathy and attention on the part of her parents. Great as are the merits of the play, the subject is too little adapted for a drama to make it a success on the stage. Still, though the most undramatic of Ibsen's pieces, though not fraught with half as much deep meaning as 'Nora,' the 'Spectres,' and the 'Wild Duck,' it is one of the most remarkable and interesting for psychological analysis and development of character. Moreover, it is the first of the poet's social plays (excepting, perhaps, the 'Pillars of Society') which ends optimistically; the first which, after showing us great struggles and difficulties, grants us an outlook into a happier and more satisfactory future."

—A new metrical version of the poems of the Elder Edda has been made, in German, by Wilhelm Jordan, the well-known translator of the 'Nibelungen Lied' ('Die Edda.' New York: B. Westermann & Co.). It is, as a whole, a spirited rendition into alliterative verse of the old lays, whose beauties the author appreciates, and whose difficulties he smooths away with a confident hand. The translation is literary, rather than critical. Strophes considered disturbing—like the list of the dwarfs in the Völuspa—are summarily relegated to the notes that follow each lay. The result is, of course, to secure, from a modern point of view, a more perfect poem, but to vitiate, in the same degree, the spirit of the original. In many instances Jordan's strophes are as good as, in some cases even better than, those of any translation we have. In others the author, evidently actuated by a conscious desire to improve upon the original, is betrayed into a paraphrase which bears but little likeness to his Norse prototype. One of the principal merits of the new translation is the intelligibility of its vocabulary. Led astray by the seductions of old word-forms, many of which were bound up with the alliteration, most of the older translators have been irresistibly tempted into the frequent use of cognates instead of equivalents. Many of these words, in their turn, were already deep under the dust of ages, from which they first have to be freed in order to be understood. Many others, and this is particularly true of English translations, which are sometimes couched in a language that was not, is not, and never by any foreseen contingency can be, were deliberately evolved, and are as much in need of a gloss as the originals which they are supposed to explain. In his intention to avoid an affectation of archaism, on the other hand, the author of the present version occasionally makes a not altogether fortunate choice of words. The notes with which the book is liberally supplied contain explanations of words and phrases, many of them new and at variance with all accepted criticism. The author, at the end of his preface, expresses the confident hope that now at last the Edda will not be, as heretofore, "a book under seven seals." If he has not, perhaps, quite succeeded in loosing all seven of these not too strongly imagined hindrances, he has, none the less, accomplished a difficult task in a manner highly creditable to his literary judgment and to his skill in poetical expression.

CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

Notes of Conversations with the Duke of Wellington. 1831–1851. By Philip Henry, fifth Earl Stanhope. London: Murray. 1888.

Sir Philip Henry, fifth Earl Stanhope, who recorded these "Notes" of conversations with the Duke of Wellington, is best known to the world as Lord Mahon, the historian of England. During the twenty years covered by these "Notes," there existed between him and the Duke a friendship the cordiality and intimacy of which appears to have gone on increasing until the death of the great soldier; and it was the custom of Lord Stanhope to record in writing the conversation of his friend while the memory of it was still fresh in his mind. These "Notes" do not add anything of importance to our knowledge of the Duke. Their main interest arises from the confirmation which they furnish of all that was previously known of him. They show the Duke, after all the victories he had won—the foremost man in the Europe of this day—as kindly, simple, and unassuming as the humblest of her Majesty's subjects. There is something especially beautiful in his fondness for children and their responsive love for him.

"The Duke," records Lord Stanhope, under date of October 22, 1837, "has now staying with him two little children of Lord and Lady Robert Grosvenor, who are gone abroad, and his conduct to these chicks displays a kind-heartedness and warmth of feeling such as their own parents could not surpass, but such as the Duke displays to all. Lady Mahon was told by Lady Mary Grimston, who was staying in the house, that the children having expressed their desire to receive letters by the post, the Duke every morning writes a letter to each of them, containing good advice for the day, which is regularly delivered to them when the post comes in."

On another occasion, when leaving Walmer Castle for London, still imperfectly recovered from a very serious illness, Lord Stanhope learned from Mlle. Brun that the Duke stopped at Walmer village, "and got out to take leave of Lady Wilton's children. They had received so many kindnesses from him, and bore him so much attachment, that all three—poor little things—ran to the door when he wished to go again, and attempted to bar his way."

His consideration for his servants was not less remarkable than his tender thoughtfulness towards children. "Not many fathers," Lord Stanhope declares, "I really believe, are so much beloved by their children as the Duke is by his servants." Add to all this, not a truer or more constant friend than the Duke ever lived. In the days of his greatness he never forgot the friends of his earlier days, with whom he made his Indian campaigns, and of the Spanish General Alava, who was on his staff at Waterloo and all through his Spanish campaigns, Lord Stanhope has the following:

"Sir Edward Kerrison related to me not many years ago, when he was living at Brighton, he had asked Alava to dinner, and to save Alava's money (for it was during his exile) had sent his own carriage to fetch him. On arriving, Alava thanked him, and said that he felt the more anxious to avoid expense at that time since it was the Duke's money that he spent. The Duke, added he, took me to his banker and said to him, 'This is my friend; and as long as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have any money at your house, let him have it to any amount that he thinks proper to draw for.'"

But the sterling worth and simple grandeur of the Duke's character are perhaps illustrated in nothing so well as in the despatch which reports the battle of Waterloo. There is not in it a trace of boastfulness or exultation; no effort whatsoever to emphasize the magnitude of the occasion. The victory which overthrew the power of the conqueror of Europe is related as briefly, and with as entire an absence of flourish, as an insignificant skirmish:

"I breakfasted," writes Lord Stanhope, June 28, 1839, "with Hallam, and met Mr. Webster, the justly celebrated American, whose acquaintance I had already made, the day but one before, at a dinner at Lord Stanley's. He told me that on his way out he had been reading two or three odd volumes of the Duke of Wellington's despatches, and had been greatly struck at their total freedom from anything like pomp or ostentation, even in moments of greatest triumph. The Waterloo despatch itself contained nothing about victory and glory. So unpretending was it, said Mr. Webster, that Mr. Quincy Adams—who was our Minister at London at the time, and who had a good deal of bitter feeling against this country, with which peace had only just been concluded—declared on first reading the despatch that it came from a defeated general, and that in real truth the Duke's army must have been annihilated at Waterloo. This he seriously believed for some time."

Of the Duke before Waterloo, General Alava tells the following:

"After dinner, Lord Strangford alluded to Garwood's twelfth volume [*i. e.*, of the Wellington Despatches], which is just coming out, and this led the conversation to Waterloo. 'Je me rapellerai toujours,' said Alava, 'comme j'arrivais de Bruxelles, et je ne savais pas si depuis l'Espagne le Duc serait toujours la tête de Méduse pour les Français; mais quand je suis arrivé, le Duc m'a dit tout de suite, Étiez-vous chez Lady Charlotte Greville hier soir? Alors j'ai vu qu'il était tranquille, et que tout allait bien. Il m'a dit aussi: Ils seront diablement surpris, les Français, de voir comme je vais défendre une position.' The Duke laughed at these recollections, and assented to them."

This Spanish General Alava had a strange fortune. He began life as an officer in the Spanish Navy, and in that capacity the first great engagement at which he was present was the battle of Trafalgar, when, of course, he fought on the side of the French. His last battle was Waterloo, and he was, probably, the only man in Europe who had been present in both these memorable conflicts.

The Duke had a high opinion of the military genius of the first Napoleon. Of all his marshals he thought Massena the ablest, but even he was not comparable with his master. There was no soldier in whose presence it was so fatal to make a mistake as in that of Napoleon. His weakness was that he lacked the patience to fight a defensive campaign. It was to this defect mainly that the Duke attributed the ruinous failure of the Russian invasion. Napoleon here attempted to crowd into a single campaign the work of two or even three, and to a similar impatience the Duke assigns the success with which, after Leipzig, the allied armies baffled the efforts of Napoleon to defend Paris. None the less, the Duke was of opinion that Napoleon's military genius was never seen more brilliantly than in this unsuccessful campaign. "The study of it," he said, "has given me a greater idea of his genius than any other. Had he continued that system a little while longer, it is my opinion that he would have saved Paris. But he wanted patience—he did not see the necessity of adhering to defensive warfare—I have been obliged to do it for many months together—and he threw himself imprudently on the rear of the Allies. Then, of course, they marched to Paris."

This opinion was given in the presence of that high military authority, the omniscient Croker, who took it upon himself to dispute the verdict of the Duke. In his valuable opinion, the strategy of the French Emperor exhibited a remarkable want of skill. "'I can only say,' replied the Duke, 'that my opinion of the campaign is what I have stated. In it Bonaparte beat the Austrians, Prussians, and Russians—different armies—always with the same troops; and I have had experience enough to know how very exact a man must be in his calculations, and how very skilful in his manœuvres, to be able to do that.'" Croker, however, did not forego his belief that, as regards the art and practice of war, the greatest of (then) living soldiers had a good deal to learn from the editor of the *Quarterly Review*. We know, from the Greville Memoirs, that upon one occasion he set himself to contradict the Duke upon the subject of gun caps, and later, in these "Notes," we find him graciously condescending to explain to the Duke the true signification of the scarp and counterscarp of a fort ditch—premising that the Duke appeared to be ignorant on this point.

The Duke had not a high opinion of his allies, the Spaniards. The men, he admits, were fine specimens of humanity, and, taken individually, as brave as any people in the world; but, somehow or other, they could not be got to fight on a field of battle. But the battle of Baylen, suggested Lord Stanhope?

"Oh, Baylen was mismanaged by the French. I knew Dupont afterwards at Paris—he was Minister of War—a very able man, but he took fright and did not understand the Spaniards. It could not have happened again Later in the war, the French would have marched over the Spaniards, instead of capitulating to them. Their general would have said, Retirez-vous, coquins! and off they would have gone. That Baylen, too, was always in the heads of the Spanish officers. They were always for attempting the same manœuvre, and surrounding the enemy, insomuch that at last I used always to tell them before any engagement, Now, this is not a battle of Baylen; don't attempt to make it a battle of Baylen!"

Of Talleyrand there are some good stories scattered through these "Notes."

"He is not," said the Duke, "lively or pleasant in conversation, but now and then he comes out with a thing that you remember all the rest of your life. *E. g.*, Talleyrand on his return to Paris from the London Embassy was asked what might be the position in society of a certain Edward Ellice, and replied, 'Je m'en vais vous le dire. Quand on a eu un grand dîner, on donne d'ordinaire encore un réchauffé le lendemain—et c'est au second dîner qu'on invite Monsieur Ellice."

BRITISH AGRICULTURE.

The Pioneers and Progress of English Farming. By Rowland E. Prothero, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Longmans, Green & Co.

THE attractiveness, even to a lay reader, of Mr. Prothero's history of English agriculture is, to the economic student, doubled by his masterly presentation of the truth that prosperity is again possible to British farmers through the adoption of improved methods in the production of crops which the needs of the present demand, and impossible if the farmers prefer to "slumber in their empty corn-bins, dreaming of Protection," which at best would perpetuate the use of antiquated methods in the production of crops which American competition has rendered permanently unprofitable.

The author is a conservative, in sympathy with the landed interests. Nevertheless, as an investigator, he has a scientific conscience, and the statistical information in which his volume abounds, but with which his text is never burdened, is not only accurate in detail, but truthful in its grouping. In the first portion of his history, the coloring due to his political bias is scarcely perceptible. The lesson which is here strongly impressed is the value of scientific agriculture, despite the ridicule it receives from those whose range of vision is confined to the largest possible profits in the year just ahead. Every one of the improvements by which the product of English agriculture has been increased seven fold has been received with distrust by the mass of practical farmers. When Lord Townsend, in the middle of the last century, revived the practice of marling and introduced the growing of turnips from Hanover, though he thereby increased the rental of his Norfolk estates from almost nothing to fifteen shillings per acre, it was years before his example was generally followed. "Many persons classed turnips with rats among Hanoverian novelties, and refused their assistance with Jacobite indignation." A similar reception awaited Bakewell's discovery of the principle of selection in the breeding of stock. Before his day, breeding was in general "a promiscuous union of nobody's son with everybody's daughter." Only slowly did farmers adopt his principle, and in breeding use only bulls and rams which possessed the qualities they wished to reproduce. Yet, by the end of the century, the change wrought was so great that the sheep in Smithfield market, which in 1710 had weighed on the average twenty-eight pounds, in 1795 weighed eighty pounds.

It was during the period of these and other improvements which revolutionized agriculture that the enclosure of the commons began. In describing this process the author's conservative bias expresses itself in the emphasis which he gives to the resulting benefits. Common land was practically waste land. It was impossible to make improvements upon it. Enterprising men could take no action without securing the co-operation of their indifferent and ignorant partners. The substitution of individual ownership was necessitated. By the enclosure of the commons the landlords solved the problem of the greatest possible production of wealth; but the problem of its best possible distribution they completely ignored. Mr. Prothero does not attempt to conceal the fact that the helplessness of the agricultural laborer was in many sections increased, and that it would have been well for England had Parliament accepted the recommendation that the lot of the common-field farmers should be rendered as easy as possible "by laying to their cottages a sufficient portion of land to enable them to keep a cow or two." Nevertheless, he does not, like Thorold Rogers and Arnold Toynbee, bring into prominence the "socialism of capital" which the legalized confiscation of the common lands involved. There is nothing to suggest Karl Marx's picture of the Duchess of Sutherland expelling the cotters from nearly eight hundred thousand acres of clan land, and assigning them but six thousand acres on the seashore, where, as an English author with grim humor has expressed it, "they lived half on land, half on water, and withal only half lived on both." There is very little to suggest Toynbee's generalization, that mainly through the self-interested legislation of richer classes during this epoch, rents and interest on capital were doubled, while real wages were reduced nearly one-half.

Yet, in spite of his Conservative bias, Mr. Prothero does not fail to bring out certain facts illustrative of the radical doctrine, recent-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly expressed in an American state paper, that it is mockery of the people to "propose that the Government shall protect the rich, and that they in turn shall protect the poor." In a chapter devoted to the agricultural laborers, he says:

"Looking back to the period of protection, from 1790 to 1840, their condition was deplorable, a disgrace to civilization generally, and to landlords and farmers particularly. . . . The standard of life from 1800 to 1834 sank to the lowest possible scale; in the south and west, wages paid by employers fell to 3s. to 4s. per week, augmented by parochial relief from the pockets of those who had no need of labor."

Mr. Prothero's entire review of the effect of protective legislation is singularly satisfactory, and singularly full of lessons which one cannot help applying to the situation now existing in America:

"So long as protection lasted, landlords and farmers were unable to resist the gambling spirit which it fostered. . . . Inflated prices raised rentals, and vastly increased the area under corn cultivation. . . . Farmers brought nothing upon their holdings in the shape of costly manures or expensive feeding stuffs; they laid down no pipe for drainage. . . . They themselves were men of little enterprise, . . . farming by rule of thumb and from hand to mouth, investing in no improvements. . . ."

When the corn-laws were repealed, and farmers recognized that the repeal was final, they turned their attention from corn-growing, which did not pay, to stock-feeding, which did pay. Self-help took the place of Government aid. Improved machinery and improved methods were simultaneously introduced. High farming became the rule instead of the exception; and English agriculture entered upon a period of prosperity in which reduced prices were accompanied by production so largely increased that not only wages but rents rose higher than ever before.

In only two instances does Mr. Prothero's sympathy with the landlords lead him into the use of bad logic and doubtful statistics. The chief of these is in the chapter entitled "Protection Taxes on Free Trade Prices." Here, after asserting that rents have decreased 35 to 40 per cent. since 1878, and are now no higher than they were prior to 18[illegible], he insists that justice imperatively demands the remission of taxation on agricultural land, because in the earlier period local rates were offset by protective taxes, and the poor-law was so administered that the farmers' labor bill was paid by the community. The argument refutes itself. If rents are still as high as formerly, it signifies that the net income of the landlord is still as great, in spite of the fact that he no longer has protection and must now pay his own labor bill. His net income being as great, there is no reason why his taxes should not also be as great. There is, on the contrary, reason why his taxes should be greater. In 1814, says Professor Fawcett, 69 per cent. of the rates were borne by land; in 1868 but 33 per cent. The burdens of local taxation upon all other forms of property have steadily increased, upon land they have remained stationary. The other instance in which Mr. Prothero is sophistical in his argument, and more than doubtful in his statistics, is where, after picturing the wretchedness of the French peasant proprietors in a way that suggests Lady Verney, he declares that "it is the travesty of history" to assert that the peasant proprietary of France was created by legislation, inasmuch as it was firmly established before the Revolution. The best French authorities, like Paul Boiteau, author of the 'État de la France en 1789,' estimate the landowners in France before the Revolution at 450,000, 280,000 of whom were nobles and clergy. In 1812 3,799,000 French farmers owned the land which they cultivated.

Apart from the revision of taxation in the interest of the landlords, the remaining legislative proposals urged are in the line of progress and not of reaction. Chief among them are the establishment of a new system of land-transfer and the regulation of railway freight rates by a long-and-short-haul provision similar to that of the Cullom bill. At present, as every one knows, the titles of English estates can only be discovered after a prolonged search into what Cromwell termed "a godless and tortuous jungle;" and if the estate be small, the cost may often equal the purchase money. The need of railway reform is equally imperative. Our author's statement of it cannot be improved:

"Railway companies admit that they carry at a profit hops from Flushing to London for 25s.; therefore this profit must be enormous on the same weight of hops at 36s. 8d. from Sittingbourne to London. . . . Foreign perishable produce is sent through to London in fast trains from which local growers are excluded. . . . Food is cheapened, but only by bounties to foreign producers and premiums on distance at the expense of proximity."

Under no natural system, he maintains, would England import each year fresh meat, butter, eggs, fruit, and vegetables to the value of £30,600,000. It is to the production of just this class of commodities that English farmers must now turn their attention. American competition has permanently lowered the price of grain. But in the production of market-garden and dairy products, rent is by nature unimportant—labor and distance all-important. If English farmers, instead of dreaming of protection, will follow the example of those among their number who are now succeeding in adapting themselves to the new conditions by breaking up the large holdings and using improved methods and improved machinery, they may by self-help again attain a prosperity similar to that which followed their acceptance of the repeal of the corn-laws. "Twice before English agriculture has changed its front. In the sixteenth century farmers turned from the plough to pasture; in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries they reverted to tillage. Now, at the close of the nineteenth, live-stock and dairy farming must supersede corn as the farmer's sheet anchor."

RECENT NOVELS.

Leaves from the Life of a Good-for-Nothing. Translated from the German of Joseph Freiherr von Eichendorff by Mrs. A. L. Wister. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

The Romance of a Shop. By Amy Levy. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Young Maids and Old. By Clara Louise Burnham. Boston: Ticknor & Co.

A Village Tragedy. By Margaret L. Woods. Henry Holt & Co.

Temple House. By Elizabeth Stoddard. Cassell & Co.

The Peckster Professorship. By J. P. Quincy. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The Admirable Lady Biddy Fane. By Frank Barrett. Cassell & Co.

JUST why, at this day, should be translated Von Eichendorff's novelette, long known to schoolgirls and some others, it is hard to say. Probably most of the German reading public have already made its acquaintance in the original, and others will hardly be interested in it. If once they might have been so, it would be in that long-vanished time when Germany was a comparatively unknown world to us, and when its porcelain stoves, and feather beds, and the flea-stuffed sofa of Mary Howitt were novelties. German gushing romanticism is now an old story, yet hardly old enough to possess the interest of an antique. Furthermore, why this slight tale should be published in the bravest apparel, with imposing paper, print, illustrations, and binding, is renewed mystery. Given the fact, however, that there are readers still to be diverted by the sentimental fiddler of the Fatherland, with his yearnings, his pipe, and his spotted dressing-gown, then here is diversion in the fullest sense; this archaic and effusive person may be followed through a maze of adventure, now worshipping Nature, now eating bread and butter, and throughout in love with his lady fair. The work of translation has been admirably done.

The charge of obsoleteness cannot be brought against 'The Romance of a Shop,' which is modern to its uttermost comma. Four sisters, losing their father and their fortune, open a photographic studio, hoping, as one of the sisters puts it, "to become the fashion, make colossal fortunes, and ultimately marry dukes." Their hopes are in part fulfilled, yet the author does not allow the shop unpleasantly to dominate the romance, or make the story an essay in ambush on photography. When Poverty peeps in at the window, Love drives up to the door. The sisters take photographs, read Rossetti, and attend in rusty black what they are pleased to call "smart functions." At the last, one of them is led to the altar by a peer. An old love and a genius have to content two others, while the fourth is reserved for the catastrophe. A catastrophe is of course inevitable in a romance, yet the size of this one is out of proportion with the book and wears a factitious air as of stage thunder. Taken with a good deal that is commonplace in incident, it defaces a book which in style is often sprightly and in tone generally high. The printing and paper are sumptuous.

Within the covers of 'Young Maids and Old' we have not found anything as attractive as the title without. It is a pale story of slender vitality. One old maid has as hobby a nephew; another, as hers, a brother. That two young maids appear upon the scene and capture the nephew and the brother, to the consternation of their lady keepers, is matter of course. Add to this an unpleasant papa, whom even the author could not endure, and early kills; an artist, who is introduced to play the weird part of unsuccessful suitor; and an elderly deacon, who persuades one of the old maids, his early love, to become a matron on the last page, and the story is told. It is throughout perfectly correct, and may safely be sent to the hospitals as innocuous reading for the feeble.

Less cheerful reading for sick or well is to be found in 'A Village Tragedy,' which sets forth a tale of unrelieved misery. Told in a level tone of restraint which well suits the monotonous wretchedness of the story, it is undoubtedly powerful as a presentation of drear forlornness, although, rather than a tragedy, its repulsiveness suggests an almshouse report. Not too gloomy, we must fear, to be photographically true, some of its scenes are hardly fit subjects for art.

'Temple House' is quite as unhappy a book, with less of realism and more of the exaltation of tragedy. Near of kin to 'Two Men,' by the same author, it emphasizes the least agreeable phases of that striking book. It is red with blood and hot with passion, but its throbbing life is so overlaid with unreal forms that men-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tal confusion is produced within the reader, and he is left mocked and exasperated.

'The Peckster Professorship' opens like a society novel. It is, therefore, with a shock that on an early page, while Prof. Ernest Hargrave is helping Mrs. Clara Souford remove to the ice-chest, lest it should sour, "a certain creamy bubbling composition" for "the morrow's flapjacks," we find that we must be serious, and are asked to sympathize in the efforts of this man and woman to found a Professorship for Independent Spiritual Research. Let not the unwary suppose that this is all. The members of the Psychic Research Society are obsolete Philistines beside our Professor and his wife, who lead us a dance. Beginning as witnesses of their experiments for ascertaining the absolute weight of a human soul as it is leaving the body, on through sober assertions of the flight and migration of a human body from one city to another, till we assist at the projection of the spirit into the distance, into the past, into the future—we follow the scent of battle; and when, at last, astral counterparts and the Sublime Brotherhood appear, we are fairly roused to the fact that we are not to stop short of Esoteric Buddhism, with Sinnett, Col. Olcott, and Mme. Blavatsky as high priests. Prof. Hargrave, unlike some of his brother adepts, is hand and glove with science. He occupies a chair of osteology in a university near Boston (what one can be meant?) until this besotted institution decides that he is too much given to chimeras, and abolishes the professorship. He then retires to the Andes to found a brotherhood, where he invents Advanced Exercises for Will Practice, and supplies "vibrating Psychoplasm" for the rhythmic regulation of fury-heated heads in times of social revolution. His wife, once dully superintending flapjacks, now becomes a Sensitive under his influence (exerted, by the way, from Brazil upon her in Boston), and is enabled to float down the waves of time and become a witness of the future. In all this there is so much of burning conviction that, along with Dr. Bense, the ultra-scientist and doubting Thomas of the story, one grows quite credulous. The local color, given by Boston and Cambridge interiors and street scenes, furthers this result, while the constant reference to scientific authorities, mingled with a noble scorn of *mere* science, is for the hour all-convincing. The writing is learned, involved, and laborious. The fact that one is terribly bored by it at times seems one more proof of its reality as a report. Anything so heavy must be true, or why should it exist? At the last, there flames up so warm a moral and spiritual glow that we defy any one to remain quite cool under it. With its affectations, pomposities, preposterousnesses, and kindlings, this strange book leaves one with a sense of having been amused, irritated, fatigued, and exalted.

'The Admirable Lady Biddy Fane' is one of those extravaganzas which at all ages the human mind craves in one or another form. It is not likely to live as a classic, yet to the jaded reader of the bric-à-brac novel it will carry a certain tonic force. After a course of alleged mind analysis, it is a pleasure to go to sea, to be pursued by pirates, to be abandoned on desert shores, to be slain a hundred times by fire, water, and sword, to wander for two years in South American wildernesses with the girl of one's heart, to deliver her safely into her guardian's hands, and to have the double satisfaction of marrying her and of seeing one's foes hanging in a row at the yard-arm. The idyllic part of these wanderings recalls the journey of Consuelo and Haydn. There can be no doubt that the horrors are laid on too unsparingly, yet in its ferocities what unreflecting comfort! The quaint language of Elizabethan times completes its pungency.

The True Story of Hamlet and Ophelia. By Fredericka Beardsley Gilchrist. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1889.

If there is any topic on which unrestrained freedom of speech is traditionally permissible, it is *Hamlet's* mystery. Every one has been encouraged to bring the contribution of his own mad wits to its elucidation; and this has gone on so long that it might seem impossible to add new illustrations of the mind's fatuity to those which already enliven the commentary of the play. But he reckons ill who sets limits to the talent man has for fooling himself. For the hundredth time the heart has been plucked out at last, and the question settled. To the objection that this adds only one more to the theories of the play, the author says: "To this I reply—with modesty and an ardent desire to be proven in the wrong if I be wrong—that it seems to me the theory I advance destroys all other theories. For nearly three hundred years it has been possible to misunderstand, not special passages only, but the fundamental intention of the play; during that time no satisfactory explanation of *all* its obscurities has been advanced. I believe this theory explains them." And what is the secret? One wants the key at once. It is found in the lines:

> "O all you host of heaven! O earth! what else?
> And shall I couple hell?"

It seems the punctuation is wrong. The last line should read:

> "And shall I couple? Hell!"

"We know," says the author, "that no fault was more common than the interchange or omission of ? and !; and this I believe is what Shakspere wrote." How simple it is!

The bearing of this remarkable emendation is, that *Hamlet* gave up at once his love for *Ophelia*, and, his young life being thus devastated, the rest of his history is as clear as moonshine. The character of *Ophelia* is, further on, developed as that of a maiden of a sensuous temperament, distrusted by her nearest relatives, and showing in madness the current of her secret thoughts; one who needed only to be tempted to be won; and this has been discerned by *Hamlet*, who, confounded by the weakness of his mother, has had his eyes opened to the nature of woman's frailty. *Hamlet* himself is made out to be less than twenty-one years old. Naturally, the youth, having so suddenly determined not to marry, on hearing the ghost's story, falls into melancholy. It is not true, however, that he had the weakness to contemplate suicide. He never thought of it. The famous soliloquy, "To be or not to be," refers, as a German actor, Ziegler, discovered, and other German critics have agreed, to the question whether or not the play of *Gonzago* shall "be"—that is, be played before the King and Queen. *Hamlet* was not philosophizing, but planning. So the entire text is gone over, scene by scene; and it is clear to the author that there are no difficulties which do not disappear before the formula of "shall I couple?" etc., which is consequently often restated. The old "Hystorie of Hamblet" is used to bear out some of the argument, particularly with regard to *Ophelia*, and is reprinted entire at the end of the volume.

Whether this theory "destroys all others," the judicious will no doubt determine; there is still room to believe that *Hamlet's* love was an incident in a larger life, important in the structure of the action, but dissociated from many elements in the play. *Hamlet's* age is susceptible of discussion, but it is hard to reconcile his mind with his being a boy; and as to the soliloquy, the question raised is preëminently one to be threshed by the class of German critics who evolved it. The emendation made in the lines quoted, on which the author has put an unnecessary and unfortunate emphasis, is likely to have some currency as a curiosity of Shakspere criticism; it is really not essential to the argument, but it is a test of the author's qualifications, and indicates justly enough the eccentric and flimsy nature of the volume.

Truth about Russia. By W. T. Stead. Cassell & Co. 1888.

Mr. Stead's position as editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* is so peculiar that it is difficult always to distinguish between the writer and the man. It must be said, however, that, so far as Russia is concerned, Mr. Stead's attitude has always been consistent. From the beginning he has sincerely believed that Russia and England were in a false position to each other, and he has therefore tried to present to the English public the Russian side, both official and unofficial, of the questions which have arisen between the two countries. During the dispute about the Afghan boundary, and especially the Penjdeh affair, his was the only English newspaper which was willing to state truly the facts of the case. He was enabled to do this by having access to Russian sources of information. What are the terms of his literary and political partnership with Mme. Novikoff ("O. K."), it is of course impossible to say. This lady, who has a mysterious relation to the imperial family, and who for some years has played the part of an unofficial ambassadress at London, first made her appearance in literature in a series of letters contributed to a small Newcastle newspaper which Mr. Stead was then editing. Since that time she has been looked upon as his Egeria, and was for a time considered even the inspirer of Mr. Gladstone. This lady now writes for the English reviews and magazines, and contributes frequent letters to the *Times* whenever a Russian question crops up. In the book before us Mr. Stead begs the pardon of Mme. Novikoff for daring to differ from her about church questions; for he seems to be an adherent of the Salvation Army, and is indignant at the cold shoulder now shown to that Methodistical, canting Lord Radstock, his convert Pashkoff, and their followers, who were formerly received with open arms by St. Petersburg society as mitigating the asperities of the Russian Lent, when there were no balls and operas, and theatres were shut. Mme. Novikoff, however, has belabored Mr. Stead well for his strictures on the orthodox Church in a recent article in the *Contemporary Review*, entitled "A Cask of Honey with a Spoonful of Tar," in which she exposes his ignorance of Russian affairs when left to his own unguided or misguided investigations and conclusions.

Leaving out the portion of the book which is devoted to religious persecution, and the introductory chapters recounting interviews with Boulanger and Laveleye, and the author's stay at Berlin, where, it is said, Count Herbert Bismarck's indignant refusal to grant him an interview was the cause of the article on the Bismarck dynasty in the February number of the *Contemporary Review*, most of the book is taken up with Gen. Ignatieff and Count Leo Tolstoi. With the former the author had several interviews; with the latter he seems to have stayed a week, and he even dates a portion of his book from Yasnaya-Polyana. The book, on the whole, is entertaining and interesting. It contains much that is true and much

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is new to the general reader. The amateur-like suggestions for reforms and new institutions are rather amusing, especially the discussion of the tribunitial character of the Czar, and the proposal for him to increase his usefulness by becoming the editor-in-chief of a great daily newspaper for treating of the grievances of his subjects.

Popular Lectures and Addresses. By Sir William Thomson, LL.D., F.R.S., F.R.S.E., &c. In 3 vols. Vol. I. Constitution of Matter. Macmillan.

WHATEVER comes from the pen of Sir William Thomson is certain to receive a hearty welcome, not only from teachers and students, but from men of science in general. In this volume we have eleven lectures, or short papers, full of originality, and not wanting in a certain spice of humor. They are not adapted to elementary instruction, but yet are intelligible to well-trained youthful minds, and they have two eminent recommendations: they are interesting, and they are in the highest degree suggestive. Part of their interest arises from their distinctly personal character. The reader listens to the free, off-hand talk of a great master, and not to a formal ex-cathedra lecture. We do not believe that any man of science will rise from the perusal of these papers without a deepening or a shattering of old convictions, and without broader and clearer views of the possibilities of future scientific progress. It is difficult to select any paper as, in comparison with others, most worthy of notice, but we would call attention to the remarkable trains of reasoning in the lectures on the size of atoms, and in those on the sun's heat. We await the appearance of the second and third volumes of these papers with great interest. The volume before us embraces the constitution of matter; the second will include subjects connected with geology; while the third will deal chiefly with phenomena of the ocean and maritime affairs.

Great Captains. A Course of Six Lectures, showing the Influence on the Art of War of the Campaigns of Alexander, Hannibal, Cæsar, Gustavus Adolphus, Frederick, and Napoleon. By Theodore A. Dodge, U. S. A., retired. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 8vo, pp. 219.

COLONEL DODGE has published his Lowell Institute Lectures of the past winter in a very neat and readable volume under the above title. Of course, the limits of a single lecture make the treatment of the career of each of the six "great captains" a mere sketch; but the sketch is given with a freedom of drawing and an eye to perspective which produce a pleasing and vivid picture. The consistent purpose in all of them has been to show that great warriors have been great in proportion as they have possessed that high form of practical intellect which has enabled them to make a science of their work. To rise from courageous and stubborn fighters to clear thinkers as well, grasping what are now recognized as leading principles of the art of war and applying them on a great scale, is presented as the distinctive mark of the great general as contrasted with those of lesser rank. The author shows with clearness that in ancient as well as modern times the criterion of greatness has been the same, and that Frederick or Napoleon succeeded by virtue of principles and intellectual character similar to Alexander's or Cæsar's. The book is adapted to popular reading, and will prove attractive to all who have a taste for military analysis.

Sketches of a Tour through Holland and Germany. By J. P. Mahaffy and J. E. Rogers. Macmillan & Co.

DURING the last few years there has been an abundance of books on Holland. The impression one gets from nearly all of them is, that the country is one great museum of antiquities and oddities, entirely out of touch with modern civilization, except perhaps in a few large cities. The peculiar merit of Prof. Mahaffy's book, in so far as it relates to Holland, is, that while he has an open eye for the picturesque features of the country, he does not devote his whole space to them, but gives his readers a fair idea of the state of religious and political parties and of other subjects of every-day life. His views are generally sound, and (for instance, where he discusses the remarkable fact that political liberalism is nearly always allied in Holland with indifference in religious matters) he shows a clear insight into the peculiar social conditions of Holland. The author evidently is not acquainted with the Dutch language; one of his principal grievances against the Dutch is that they failed to understand him. This ignorance explains his astonishing statement that Holland had no great authors in the seventeenth century. Vondel, Hooft, Huyghens, who would reflect honor on any literature, do not seem to be known to him.

The author feels much more at home in Holland than in Germany. The want of material comfort, as compared with Holland, seems to have irritated him as much as the lack of political liberty, and, consequently, his denunciation of the Bismarckian régime is severe and occasionally flippant. This part of the work is chiefly interesting because it gives a description of a part of Germany rarely visited, viz., the Baltic provinces and some old cities in the interior.

The book is handsomely got up, and the illustrations are of more than average merit.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Balzac, H. Cousin Pons. Frederick Warne & Co.
Bellamy, Mrs. Penny Lancaster, Farmer. Frank P. Lovell & Co. 50 cents.
Bernard, V. F. Le Genre des Noms. W. R. Jenkins.
Brown, W. H. The Slaves of Folly. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Bryan, Mrs. Mary E. My Own Son. George Munro. 25 cents.
Bunce, O. B. The Story of Happinolande, and Other Legends. D. Appleton & Co. 25 cents.
Burhans, J. A. The Law of Municipal Bonds, including a Digest of Statutory Laws Relating to their Issue. S. A. Kean & Co.
Burke, Edmund. A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful. Scribner & Welford. 60 cents.
Burton—Pringle. The Processes of Pure Photography. The Scovill and Adams Co. $2.
Campbell, Helen. Under Green Apple Boughs. Illustrated. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 50 cents.
Chambers's Encyclopædia. Vol. III. Catarrh to Dion. New ed. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $3.
Chambers, F. H. Fun and Fact. J. S. Ogilvie.
Cheyne, Prof. T. K. Jeremiah: His Life and Times. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. $1.
Coignet, Clarissa. Francis the First and His Times. Translated by Fanny Tremlow. Scribner & Welford. $5.00.
Dale, A. A Marriage below Zero. G. W. Dillingham. 50 cents.
Davy, E. M. Jack Dudley's Wife. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Deane, H. Daniel: His Life and Times. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. $1.
Dolaro, Selina. Bella-Demonia: A Dramatic Story. Belford, Clarke & Co.
Doty, A. H. A Manual of Instruction in the Principles of Prompt Aid to the Injured. D. Appleton & Co. $1.25.
Draw Poker without a Master: How to Play the Game with Success. G. W. Dillingham.
Essayes of Montaigne. Translated by John Florio. Edited by Justin H. McCarthy. London: David Stott. 2 vols. $1.50 each.
Findlay, Prof. G. G. The Epistle to the Galatians. A. C. Armstrong & Son.
Foote, A. R. Economic Value of Electric Light and Power. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. $1.
Gilman, N. P. Profit-Sharing Between Employer and Employee: A Study in the Evolution of the Wages System. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.75.
Guillemard, F. H. H. The Cruise of the *Marchesa* to Kamschatka and New Guinea. With Maps and Woodcuts. 2d ed. Scribner & Welford. $5.
Hamilton, Alice King. Lochinvar; or, Told by an Army Fireside. United Service Publishing Co.
Hardy, A. S. Passe Rose. Roston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Hazard, R. G. Economics and Politics: 1840–1885. Causation in Freedom and Willing. Freedom of Mind in Willing. Essay on Language, and Other Addresses. 4 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
Hoey, Mrs. Cashel. The Queen's Token. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Lady Bluebeard: A Novel. Harper & Bros.
Lee, B. Thomas Hard, Priest. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 50 cents.
Linskill, Mary. In Exchange for a Soul. Frank P. Lovell & Co. 30 cents.
McClelland, M. G. Burkett's Lock. Cassell & Co. 50 cents.
Mivart, St. G. On Truth: A Systematic Inquiry. Scribner & Welford. $6.
Monier-Williams, Sir M. Buddhism, in its Connection with Brahmanism and Hinduism, and its Contrast with Christianity. Macmillan & Co. $5.25.
Norton, C. E. Letters of Thomas Carlyle. 1826–1836. Macmillan & Co. $2.50.
Ohnet, G. Dr. Rameau. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Ohnet, G. The Double Wrong, or a Broken Life. Pollard & Moss.
Oliphant, Mrs. Lady Carr: The Sequel of a Life. The Judge Publishing Co. 25 cents.
Our Pariahs among the Tramps. Belford, Clarke & Co.
Page, T. E. P. Vergili Maronis Æneidos Lib. II. Macmillan & Co. 40 cents.
Peck, W. The Story of the Puritans: A Go-as-you-please History. St. Johnsbury, Vt.: Charles T. Walter.
Plummer, C. S. Leaves from a Drummer's Diary. Belford, Clarke & Co.
Rexdale, R. Saved by the Sword: A Novel. American News Co. 50 cents.
Rock, G. The Crime of the Golden Gully. Pollard & Moss. 25 cents.
Sergeant, A. Esther Denison. Henry Holt & Co. $1.
Sergeant, Adeline. Under False Pretences. Frank P. Lovell & Co. 50 cents.
Saltus, E. A Transaction in Hearts: An Episode. Belford, Clarke & Co.
Sidney, Margaret. Five Little Peppers, and How They Grew. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. 25 cents.
Sims, G. R. A Missing Husband, and Other Tales. J. S. Ogilvie.
Sharp, W. Romantic Ballads and Poems of Phantasy. 2d ed. London: Walter Scott.
Smith, F. H. A White Umbrella in Mexico. With Illustrations by the Author. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Smith, Rev. G. A. The Book of Isaiah. Vol. I. A. C. Armstrong & Co.
Smith, W. W. A Treatise on Private Corporations. Philadelphia: Rees, Welsh & Co.
Southey, R. The Life of Wesley and the Rise and Progress of Methodism. Frederick Warne & Co.
Souvestre, Emile. Confessions d'un Ouvrier. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 30 cents.
Steam: Its Generation and Use. New York: The Babcock and Wilcox Co.
Stevenson, E. I. Janus. Belford, Clarke & Co.
St. John, Sir S. Hayti; or, the Black Republic. 2d ed. Scribner & Welford. $2.50.
Stock, St. G. Deductive Logic. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.25.
Stockton, F. R. The Great War Syndicate. P. F. Collier.
Times and Days, being Essays in Romance and History. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.50.
Todd, C. B. The Story of Washington, the National Capital. Illustrated. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.75.
Young, Prof. C. A. A Text-Book of General Astronomy, for Colleges and Scientific Schools. Boston: Ginn & Co. $2.50.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places. $2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

THEODORE MUNDORFF, OPTIcian. Care of the sight. Brazilian pebbles, eyeglasses, opera-glasses, field-glasses, etc. 1167 Broadway, New York, under Coleman House.

THE AUSTRALIAN BALLOT SYSTEM.
By J. H. WIGMORE.
Cloth, $1.00, net; paper, 75 cents, net.
A compilation of the Ballot Acts of various Countries and States—under the system of secret balloting known as the Australian. With an Historical Introduction and Notes.
Published by CHARLES C. SOULE, 15½ Beacon St., BOSTON.

OLD BOOK LIST. NO. I. Series of 1889, just issued. Choice old Books from private Libraries, fine, rare, curious, and out-of-the-way books, ALL AT GREATLY REDUCED PRICES. A copy will be SENT FREE to any address.
ESTES & LAURIAT, Dealers in Old and Rare Books, 301–305 Washington St. (opposite "Old South"), BOSTON, MASS.

TYPEWRITER, with best facilities and ability. Address "Author's Assistant," care *Nation.*

OLD BOOKS, CATALOGUES ISSUED. GEORGE P. HUMPHREY, Rochester, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED